

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

Vol. XVI

NOVEMBER, 1945

No. 11

---

## Trends and Tendencies of the Times

(Concluded)

### Capitalism or Socialism?

We turn now to a discussion of trends in the social and economic field. It has become almost a habit to refer to our times as a period of crisis or transition. Writers on social subjects invariably predict great changes in the entire structure of our society. An English economist recently summed up the situation in this way: "It is my profound conviction that we are standing today at the turning-point between two civilizations, one of those turning-points in history not unlike the first or second century, the Renaissance, or the 17th century in England. The transition from an individualistic to a collective state of society is at hand." ("Christianity and Social Revolution," p. 177, quoted from *The World Today*, p. 35.)

Mrs. Lindbergh has written a book entitled *The Wave of the Future*, and in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, June 1941, p. 682, she explains her basic thesis in these words: "It is, as I see it, a movement of adjustment to a highly scientific, mechanized, and material era of civilization, with all its attendant complications, and as such it seems to me inevitable. I feel we must 'guide' the Wave of the Future. 'Guiding' a wave—to toss exact literary parallels to the winds—does not mean lying down prostrate on the beach and letting it pound you into the sand. Quite the opposite. It means taking advantage of that wave and controlling it with all the powers at your disposal. It means meeting the changes that are coming in the world before they are forced upon us by cataclysms and violence. That great changes are coming seems to me inescapable—inescapable with or without war, with or without the dictators, for we have set these changes in motion ourselves."

Whether we have arrived at an actual turning point between

two entirely different civilizations at the present time remains to be seen. Certain it is that great changes are in the offing.

Now, if we ask ourselves what is the trend today, there can be no doubt that it may be characterized as a movement *away from capitalism*, as our present system is called, towards some kind of *socialism or collectivism*. This does not mean that capitalism is definitely on the way out and that after this war it will disappear altogether. It may be that the present trend will be arrested and that some modified form halfway between capitalism and socialism will emerge to take its place; for changes come slowly, and there is seldom if ever an abrupt break with the past.

However, to understand all this, it is necessary that we first of all get a clearer idea of what capitalism really is and what distinguishes it from other systems. Capitalism is not easily defined. That is in part due to the word itself, which can be used in different ways. When we hear the word capital, we almost invariably think of money wealth. If a person has \$10,000.00 in the bank drawing interest or if he lends this out on interest, that's his capital, and he is called a "capitalist." However, economists do not use the word capital in that sense only. Actually, any fund of wealth is capital. When we speak of the capital wealth of Canada, we mean everything of value in that country. Whatever you possess is your capital, even the clothes on your back. In the business world the term is usually employed to refer to the stock of wealth with which the business enterprise is carried on. Thus in the case of a manufacturing concern its machinery, buildings, trucks, and everything else the company owns constitutes its capital. This is really *instrumental capital*, because it includes all the tools and instruments which the company uses in the process of production. What we actually use in our daily lives, such as food, clothing, living quarters, pleasure cars, and the like, may be called *consumer's capital*. Besides this economists also speak of *land capital*, which refers to natural wealth. All natural resources and our great land acreage would come into this category.

From this it will be seen that the term "capitalism" is very inapt, for in any kind of system today, these three kinds of capital would exist. To say, then, that "capitalism" is a system in which "capital" plays an important role is beside the mark. There always has been and there always will be *land capital*, *instrumental capital*, and *consumer's capital*.

The unabridged dictionary defines capitalism as a "system that favors the concentration of capital in the hands of the few." Others describe it as a setup that is based upon the profit motive. And still others claim it is an economic machine that makes rich people richer and the poor poorer.

While there is some truth in these statements, none of them really explains the true nature of capitalism and points out its fundamental basis. If we analyze the situation rightly, it will become evident that the real difference between our system and others revolves about the question: Who is to own and control capital? Perhaps we can understand this best if we contrast capitalism with socialism. Under socialism a larger group, almost invariably the state, owns or controls capital, particularly the means of production. Under capitalism ownership and control is in the hands of private people — individuals or groups of individuals. Almost all land, factories, railroads, mines, stores, houses, clothing, food, and so on, are today privately owned. Of course, there is some common property even now, such as roads, parks, waterworks, etc., but that is a very, very small part of the total wealth of the country. The present system might therefore best be called one of *private property* and its concomitant *free enterprise*. Those are really the two characteristics which differentiate it from other possible systems. Anyone who wants rightly to understand our present setup must keep those two features in mind. They also form the principal demands in the agitation of social reformers. They are constantly demanding that this control of capital and enterprise should be taken out of the hands of individual persons and put into the hands of the state or, as they say, into the hands of the people.

But someone might say at this juncture: Has there not always been private property? Was this not the case in ancient times and even in feudal Europe? Indeed, is not the existence of private property implied in the Seventh Commandment? This is true so far as it goes. We here merely assert that private property is a *sine qua non* in modern capitalism.

It would be interesting to trace the history and development of our present system. Roughly speaking, we may say that modern capitalism began with the advent of a money economy in the 13th and 14th centuries. As long as land was the chief source of wealth and the feudal system held sway, one could not speak of capitalism in our sense. But when money came into general use and it became possible to accumulate large private fortunes which in turn could be invested in business enterprises, you had all the elements of modern capitalism. This, of course, was extended tremendously after the industrial revolution and the expansion of trade in the 18th and 19th centuries. Given, then, a *money economy* and the *right of individuals to own and control wealth*, you have what we call modern capitalism.

This basic institution of our society has far-reaching implications:

1. The ownership of property carries with it the right to use that property as one sees fit, to dispose of it by sale or gift, and to

prevent the use of it by others. "Control extends even after the death of the owner, who may by will decree what shall be done with it; and the law will see to it that his wishes are carried out. These rights are not absolute and may be restricted if exercised in a manner injurious to other members of society. For instance, if a man maintains a public nuisance on his property, the courts will restrain him, and he may be prevented from using his wealth for dishonest or immoral purposes. But, in general, there is substantial control by the owner; and within wide limits, he can dispose of his property as he wills." (Bye, *Principles of Economics*, p. 493.)

2. Furthermore, as long as the institution of private property exists, it is implied that there will be *freedom of enterprise*. This is in a large measure what the framers of our American Constitution had in mind when they spoke of "liberty" and the "pursuit of happiness." Each individual should be free to engage in any kind of work or line of production he sees fit. He may produce threshing machines, mouse traps, or hatpins. He may be a farmer, manufacturer, or a workman. There is no higher power which says what he must do or what he must produce. Again, this privilege is not absolute, but by and large a person is free to engage in any kind of enterprise.

3. That simply means that a person is left to follow the dictates of *self-interest*. The thing that will guide him in the choice of his occupation will be the market value of his labor or his line of production. He will not continue to work for nothing or make things he cannot sell. He will soon stop producing hatpins if the ladies quit wearing them, because there will be no market for his product and the price will drop to practically nothing. It will be to his own advantage to do the thing for which he is best fitted and which brings him the greatest net income. For that reason it has been said that our economic order is based upon self-interest as the driving force moving the wheels of industry.

4. Closely allied with this is the idea of *profit*. A person engages in this or that type of production because it brings him a profit. If he does not make more than his expenses, he will be forced to close down. Because of this situation our system has also been called the "*profit system*" or the "*price system*." Upon close scrutiny it will be seen that this feature is a direct result of the basic institution of private property and free enterprise.

5. Another natural accompaniment of private property and free enterprise is *competition*. Anyone, for example, who makes plows will try to make his plows as good as possible, so that he can sell them. As soon as he does so, he is in competition with other plow makers and, for that matter, with the makers of implements of all



kinds. And this holds true with regard to any activity that one might name. Competition, therefore, is almost universal in our economic system, and we rely upon it largely to secure industrial efficiency. "In farming, mining, manufacturing, banking, merchandising, and so on, there goes on a continual struggle for existence, in which the less able producers fail and are eliminated. He who is the quickest and surest of judgment, who watches the markets and the cost with the most unerring eye, and who can best foresee coming changes in the demand, the supply, or the conditions of production for a commodity, is most likely to succeed. In each industry there is a battle to maintain the best markets and the lowest costs. The competition of buyers and sellers tends to keep prices down to the level of costs and to keep the costs as low as the existing state of productive technique and the ability of the producers make possible. Within each plant, moreover, there is competition among the employees to win promotion to the best positions. So all along the line there is a continuous rivalry which acts as a powerful incentive to efficiency." (Bye, *op. cit.*, p. 465.) As a consequence our system has also been called the "*competitive system*."

6. Now, competition invariably brings with it *inequality in wealth* and income. This stands to reason, for people themselves are unequal. In the race some are going to move faster, and others will lag far behind. Some are more industrious, some are more intelligent, and some "have more luck." If a person is a laborer and his kind of skill is scarce, he is paid a higher wage. If he is enterprising and has a large amount of business acumen, he can foresee events and make his investments accordingly. The natural result of such a process of income getting is that some will receive more, others less; and if there are no restrictions, yea, even in spite of restrictions, some receive very much and others hardly enough to keep body and soul together. It has been said that in the United States, which today has a higher standard of living than any other nation, about 30 per cent of the people are living on a bare subsistence level and that 4 per cent own 80 per cent of the wealth of the nation.

Because of this fact some have described the capitalistic system as one which operates in the interest of the few and for the exploitation of the masses. But our presentation has shown that such extreme inequality is not of the essence of capitalism, but rather a consequence of the freedom, or rather the misuse of freedom, allowed in an economic order in which private property and free enterprise prevail.

Because of the freedom from government interference our system is also called *laissez faire*. This French term means "let alone" and refers to the idea that the government should let each

individual alone to seek his economic advantage as he sees fit. It is held that a normal person is the best judge of what is good for himself. In general he will find the niche in society for which he is best suited. Furthermore, if his occupation is his own choice, he will feel better about it, will work with greater enthusiasm, and in the end contribute more to the general welfare than if hedged in by all kinds of government regulations. Thus self-interest and the natural law of supply and demand would automatically work out to the good of all, and the sum total of human happiness would be the greater.

These doctrines were eagerly taken up by the utilitarians (Jeremy Bentham, the Mills, etc.), whose leitmotiv was "the greatest good to the greatest number." Originally, however, they were promulgated in opposition to the system called "mercantilism," which held sway before that, particularly in the 17th and 18th centuries. Under mercantilism all industry and commerce was to be carried on in the interest of the state. The coffers of the king had to be filled. And the way to do that was to encourage industry so that you could sell more to other countries than you bought from them. The doctrine of a "favorable trade balance" was believed in as gospel truth. Hence there were minute regulations for all businesses. It is said that the rules for the textile industry in France, for example, covered over 2,000 pages. Even the number of threads in every fabric was prescribed, and there was rigid enforcement. 16,000 people are estimated to have lost their lives because of infractions of the rules covering calico alone.

*Laissez faire* was a protest against this system and was in line with the general demand of the times for more freedom in all phases of life. Its chief proponent was *Adam Smith*, who in 1776 produced that epoch-making work called *Wealth of Nations*.

Naturally, Smith's ideas were not adopted at once, but as time went on one government restriction after another was abolished, and *laissez faire* became the guiding principle of the new economic order; although we must keep in mind that at no time, not even in the heyday of 1860, was there complete *laissez faire* in any country.

*Laissez faire*, then, was but another concession to liberalism and individualism; and as we look back, we must say that in the short space of 125 years this system made greater advances in the economic sphere than were made since the time of Abraham, almost 4,000 years earlier. Not only was there a marvelous expansion in the production of goods of all kinds, but, despite a great increase in population, also a great enhancement of the average wealth per person; in other words, the average standard of living has risen far beyond anything ever known before.

However, it soon developed that the new system, which quite generally came to be called capitalism, did not guarantee economic justice and the well-being of society. Economic freedom meant in too many cases freedom for the wealthy but practically slavery for the masses. The employers had all the advantage. Since they also controlled governments, they could have laws passed in their own interests, and low wages and sweatshops were the result for the workers. The lust for profits led to unscrupulous competition and inhuman practices, the race for new markets and raw materials, and even to imperialistic wars between nations.

Because of all this, many people are today condemning capitalism as unchristian. "Self-interest rules supreme," say they. "Rugged individualism leads to a dog-eat-dog policy. It's everyone for himself, and the devil take the hindmost. And even the better element in society is forced to go along with this policy or perish in the mad scramble."

It is well known that the United Church in Canada, in an official pronouncement a few years ago, roundly condemned capitalism as immoral. Recently leading divines and influential laymen of the Anglican Church met at Malvern, England, under the leadership of the Archbishop of York and adopted resolutions such as the following:

1. "Christian doctrine must insist that production exists for consumption . . . to a large extent production is carried on not to supply the consumer with goods, but to bring profits to the producer. . . . This method . . . becomes the source of unemployment at home and dangerous competition for markets abroad. . . . The monetary system must be so administered that what the community can produce is made available to the members of the community, the satisfaction of human needs being accepted as the only true end of production.

2. "The true status of man independent of economic progress must find expression in the managerial framework of industry; the rights of labor must be recognized as in principle equal to those of capital in the control of industry, whatever the means by which this transformation is effected.

3. "In international trade a genuine interchange of materially needed commodities must take the place of a struggle for so-called favorable balance. . . . We must recover reverence for the earth and its resources, treating it no longer as a reservoir of potential wealth to be exploited, but as a storehouse of divine bounty on which we utterly depend.

4. "After the war, our aim must be the unification of Europe as a co-operative commonwealth.

5. "The Church has the duty and the right to speak not only to its members, but to the world, concerning the true principles of human life. . . . The Church, as we know it, does not. . . . We therefore urge that enterprises be initiated whereby that life can be made manifest."

And this was not all. An amendment with far-reaching implications was moved by a Liberal Member of Parliament, Sir Richard Acland: "In the present situation we believe the Church should declare that the maintenance of that part of the structure of our society by which the ownership of the great resources of our community can be vested in *private individuals is a stumbling block*, making it harder for the generality of men to live Christian lives."

A little later the North American Ecumenical Conference, with delegates from almost all Protestant and non-Roman communions from the Caribbean to the Arctic, met in Toronto. "Its consensus: 1) Hitler is fighting the war with an idea; 2) Christianity, to survive, must show the world it has a better idea; 3) this will require a drastically different social order in the postwar world; 4) the Church must offer some leadership toward a more constructive and more lasting peace than Versailles.

"The haves should share with have-nots. Re-asserted was a Federal Council pronouncement of last December, calling for a world where economic opportunity is not the legal monopoly of those national groups which through accident or prior aggression have obtained control of the bounties of nature."

Said one report: "People must be provided with basic shelter, food, fuel, clothing, and health services, even if all the people, including the rich, have to be rationed."

Thus Toronto echoed Malvern. It declared that in North America, as well as in Germany and England, things are in such a mess that a solution to the unemployment problem has been found only in armament programs. "We can well say, with our fellow Christians in England," said one speaker, "that the system under which we have lived has been a predisposing cause of war, even though those who direct and profit by it have desired peace." These solutions were suggested: "State planning; wider use of producers' and consumers' co-operatives."

And Dr. C. C. Morrison, editor of the *Christian Century*, had this to say in a sermon delivered at the University of Chicago: "The housekeeping of mankind is organized as a system of both domestic and imperial greed. This greed is an expression of both human need and human sin. The perennial tragedy to which it leads inheres in the fact that this need and this sin are forced to live together in an *economic system which falsifies human dignity* by

tying up the satisfaction of elemental human needs with the necessity of injuring or oppressing or even killing others. This is why the nations fight. We cannot hope for peace while the nations cherish the unjust privileges upon which their economic life is based." (Quoted from CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY for September, 1940.)

Also within our own circles similar voices are being heard. In an essay read before the Professors' Conference at River Forest, Dr. Haentzschel writes: "There is evidently an inherent clash of interest between competitive capitalism and labor, between profits and human welfare." And again: "The capitalistic system as it has arisen out of *laissez faire* contains no spiritual values but is hostile to them in its nature. Its heart and soul are profits; it is purely materialistic. As it has grown, it has more and more centered American life and thought about money. The possession of money has become the supreme ambition, the mark of success in life, the badge of honor. Other values have correspondingly been overshadowed and diminished, including the religious and moral values which serve as a check to antisocial tendencies and on which depends the health and preservation of society, not to speak of higher goods. That the modern economic system is *intrinsically the incarnation of selfishness*, without benefit of higher motives, soon became, as we have seen, painfully evident in its workings. It exalted profits and property rights above human rights and generated glaring social injustices and ills." (*Minutes of the Professors' Conference*, p. 56.)

Now, what shall we say to this? Certainly it is a very serious matter; for if Dr. Morrison is right, if our present economic order really forces us "to injure or oppress or even kill others in order to satisfy our elemental human needs," if it is "*intrinsically the incarnation of selfishness*," then, of course, we should all be unalterably opposed to it, and as Christian pastors and citizens we should do all we can to have it abolished and bring in a new order.

But is that really the case? It seems to us that we go too far if we condemn capitalism *per se*. It isn't the system as such, but rather the abuse of such privileges which it permits that is the root of the trouble. After all the capitalistic system merely allows a certain amount of freedom in economic life. If human beings do not have the moral character to use that freedom correctly, if they rather misuse it to exploit the neighbor, then we should not say the system in itself is immoral.

If it be argued that experience shows that man always abuses that freedom to the detriment of his fellow men, the answer is that the same holds with regard to any freedom that man has. It may be necessary to curtail the freedom of the individual in the interest of



the larger group. It may even be found expedient to abolish the whole system and put something better in its place, but the evil doesn't inhere in the system, it inheres in the heart of man.

And this is not intended as an argument in favor of the *status quo*. On the other hand, if we are opposed to capitalism and wish to abolish it, let us make sure of what we want in its place; else the cure may be worse than the disease. Stephen Leacock says there is very much wrong with a system that depends on private buying and private selling, but that it is the only system that ever worked outside the Garden of Eden.

What is obviously being worked out in North America today is a compromise between capitalism and socialism. If this can be accomplished, the two extremes — unregulated capitalism and complete socialism — will be avoided. In our opinion this would be the best solution of the problem with which we are faced today. Unless we believe in the possibility of such a compromise, the only alternative to our present order is socialism or collectivism.

As already stated, there is a definite trend in that direction. Let us now try to analyze this trend and seek to determine what its introduction would imply.

The two terms "socialism" and "collectivism" are practically synonymous today and refer to any system in which the control of property and industry no longer is exercised by private individuals, but inheres in larger groups. Strictly speaking, "collectivism" is the better word, since it has a wider connotation and certain forms of collective ownership are often not called socialism, but for practical purposes the two may be used interchangeably.

There are of course all shades of socialism, from the most radical communism down to the mildest form of democratic management of industry by a community for the benefit of its members. The various forms or types may be conveniently classified as follows:

- |                    |                            |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. State socialism | 4. Christian socialism     |
| 2. Guild socialism | 5. Consumers' co-operation |
| 3. Syndicalism     |                            |

a. Consumers' co-operation, to begin with the last, would be an organization of all consumers, that is, all people, in societies for the benefit of producing for use and not for profit, *e. g.*, co-operative stores, co-operative insurance societies, etc. This would be a kind of voluntary socialism. The renowned Kagawa of Japan and many other Christian leaders believe this would be the solution of our problems. They call it "Christianizing the economic order."

b. Christian socialism accepts the socialist ideal on ethical rather than on economic grounds and sees in the movement an

effort to realize the teachings of Christ rather than a struggle of classes for material advantages.

c. Syndicalism aims at the federation of workers in all trades into an effective organization, strong enough to enforce the demands of labor. The cry of the syndicalists is "one big union." If the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. became powerful enough, we should have a form of syndicalism.

d. Guild socialism represents an attempt at a compromise between state ownership and syndicalism. Each industry would organize into a guild, to which all engaged in that industry, both managers and workers, would belong. Italy and Germany before the surrender had a kind of guild system, except, of course, that the state controlled all the units in the organization.

We cannot go into a discussion of all of these at this time. We shall concern ourselves entirely with state socialism, all the more since it seems evident that any kind of successful collectivism would ultimately be state socialism. Any organization which would become strong enough to control industry in this our industrial society would simply be the state. And, besides, practically all socialists today are making every effort to gain political control. They know that without that they will never have a chance to bring in their reforms and carry out a socialistic program.

In a very real sense the movement of socialism represents a pushing upward and a clamoring for recognition on the part of the lower classes. It gained strength in the middle of the last century chiefly through the writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Marx is the apostle of the proletariat, the workers, and perhaps rightly called the father of modern socialism. Certainly, his influence in the various countries has been greater than that of any other writer. His *Kapital*, published in 1867, is still the Bible for most socialists, and it was his system that Lenin tried to introduce in Russia. It may be well, therefore, that we briefly summarize the Marxian philosophy. It embraces, above all, these five major points:

1. The first and most fundamental is his economic or materialistic interpretation of history. Marx holds that everything always has and always will depend upon economics. Other things are not important. The general social order at any given time is always determined by the manner in which the people produce and exchange goods. The technique of making a living will decide what kind of political setup, what kind of religion, what kind of customs, what kind of anything they will have. It will also determine which classes in a society will be on top and which below. In ancient times there were masters and slaves, in the Middle Ages feudal

lords and serfs, and now we have the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the capitalists and the workers.

2. Because of this there has always been a class struggle. "The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles," says the famous *Communist Manifesto* of 1848. The interests of one class always conflict with those of another: it is employers against employees, landlords against renters, capitalists against wage earners. The Church is always found on the side of the privileged classes; "religion is the opium of the people." Political power is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another.

3. The only one who really earns is the laborer. This constitutes Marx' "theory of the value of labor." Under capitalism the capitalist takes most of the profit, while the laborer gets barely enough to eke out an existence. Thus he is constantly exploited.

4. Because of its very nature capitalism cannot grow without at the same time pushing a larger and larger percentage of people into the wage-earner class, for wealth will be concentrated more and more in the hands of a very few by monopolies. This situation cannot last. Finally the masses of the proletariat will rise in their wrath and overwhelm the oppressors, just as the burgher class overwhelmed the feudal lords. Marx believed this revolutionary cataclysm was inevitable. He lived at the time of Darwin and felt that his theory paralleled the biological evolution of Darwin. The social revolution was foreordained in accordance with the materialistic interpretation of history. "It rested upon the relations between the physical constitution of the earth and the mental and physical attributes of man." (Dunning, *Political Theories*, p. 374.)

5. In the inevitable upheaval the proletariat will seize control by force. The "expropriators will be expropriated." In the new order everyone will be a worker. Each will contribute according to ability and receive according to his needs. The classless society will be a reality, for any basis for classes and class antagonism will have been swept away. Society will have become "an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

That is, in brief, the doctrine of Marx. His system is usually called communism. It distinguishes itself from other forms of socialism in that it is the most radical. At the same time it is not only anti-Christian, but antireligious. Religion is not merely disregarded, but roundly denounced as harmful. Economic goods are the only things that count; spiritual values are of no avail. Thus the whole view of life of the Marxists is materialistic and hence atheistic and in a very real sense degrading to man.

As stated, Marx's influence has been tremendous, and it has been asserted that all socialism is Marxian and that no active socialist could remain a Christian. Yet we believe this is going too far. In the light of later developments and in view of the fact that there are so many kinds of socialism, we may say that a Christian *can* be a socialist and that all who favor collectivism are not necessarily antireligious in their sentiments. The present government of New Zealand, for example, is largely socialistic without bowing to anti-Christian communism.

Certain strands of communistic thought of course appear in all socialistic camps. Chief among these is the demand for collective ownership and control of industry by society. This, as already pointed out, is the fundamental tenet of socialism. All socialists denounce capitalism with its profit motive as the incarnation of social injustice, leading invariably to exploitation of the masses and enrichment of the few. They demand a planned economy in place of the haphazard system now in vogue. Only then, say they, can the needs of society be satisfied, for property relations will no longer be a restriction on production, and the productive classes will be guaranteed the full use of the products of their labor.

And the demands of the socialists are being heeded. The growing concentration of power in the hands of the central government, the increased interference in industry, the expansion of governmental ownership, the passage of social security acts, the increase in state credit to the people of low income, the immense taxes upon the rich and various other New Deal measures, are all signs of this trend toward a collectivistic order. During the depression there was of course a great amount of agitation for a change in our system, and many were calling for abolishing capitalism altogether.

Now, what shall we say to this? Or do such matters not concern us as pastors and church members? A little thought will reveal that they do. We owe it to ourselves and to the Church to strive for clarity on these issues, for they vitally affect the lives of our people and cannot be divorced from moral implications. Many of our members are being influenced by socialistic propaganda. They rant against capitalism with the best of them. When you ask them: "And what do you want in place of the present system?" they say, "Some form of socialism. That will at least make it impossible for the big guns to get everything and give us little fellows a chance."

In order to evaluate the movement rightly, it is necessary that we keep in mind certain considerations which are always pertinent when socialism is discussed. Our space is limited, and we submit very briefly what we consider the more important items. The

eleven points we first stress are not based on the Bible; they represent what many thinkers have arrived at on the basis of common sense and experience.

1. First and foremost is the consideration that every kind of socialism means a *tremendous increase in the power of government* and that when the state has great power, the individual has less freedom. There is an old saying that if you "*abolish private property, you have dictatorship; and if you have a dictatorship, you no longer have private property.*" Experience has borne out the truth of this statement. Remember that even Hitler called his system National Socialism, and Dictator Stalin, who has succeeded in collectivizing even agriculture in Russia, claims he has the best form of collectivism. It simply remains an axiom that whoever controls the economic life of a people controls that people altogether. The power of the big money men over industry is great today, but it is small compared with the power of the government officials in a socialistic state. Since our economic system is so highly complex, no government, even though it were constantly in power, could supervise everything. It would be forced to adopt arbitrary methods, and thus authoritarianism in the economic and political sphere would be inevitable.

2. Also the laboring class would lose its freedom; for since practically everybody would be working for the government, it would be almost treason to go on strike. A worker would have to stay on the job assigned to him. If he didn't, the state as the only employer could easily prevent him from getting another position.

3. By controlling almost all resources a government could easily perpetuate itself. The party in power could readily marshal the necessary votes, for between elections all people would be working for it.

4. In introducing socialism we would merely be taking control from one group and putting it into the hands of another. What guarantee have we that this new group would always work for the best interests of the people? Would the socialistic system guarantee a higher type of government official?

5. Socialists argue that competition would be done away with. This is a fallacy. Competition is a fundamental social process. It exists wherever people live together in larger groups.

6. A socialistic system to be and remain democratic, as its advocates contend it must, would demand a citizenship with a thorough understanding of economic principles, for economics and politics would be interwoven still more than they are now. Experience proves that it is impossible to reach the stage where the



mass of the people actually study such problems and are thus able to make intelligent decision with regard to these matters.

7. The only way the government could gain control of property is by *confiscation*. Some argue the government could buy the property from present owners. This is a contradiction. How can the state gain control of property if it gives the present owners some other property?

8. All collectivism tends to discourage if not to paralyze initiative. Owing to general regimentation, the freedom of choice and action would be seriously restricted. Men would be apt to say, "Why work hard and try something new? We cannot improve our lot anyway."

9. Under socialism the individual would in a large measure be relieved of personal responsibility. Even now we have too many who say, "Why worry? The state will take care of us." This business of depending upon the government for everything is serious.

10. Socialists claim that "planned production" will obviate disorganization and avoid much waste. In this way the amount of goods produced would be increased, and there would be more for each to consume. In other words the standard of living would rise. While it must be admitted that authoritarian governments are "terribly" efficient in this respect, there is grave doubt whether that system is best in the long run. Arbitrary though well-intended interference of government officials would be frequent, and the danger of disturbing the balance of economic forces could hardly be avoided.

11. Socialists insist that the profit motive must be done away with. People would have to work for the welfare of the community and not for their own benefit. That simply means that socialism, to be effective, would require a higher type of citizen morally, or, as some one has put it, "Socialism would work if everybody were a good Christian." True, but the same may be said of capitalism.

These are some of the points we must keep in mind when we are trying to determine whether socialism offers promise and hope for a solution of our social problems. From the more specific view of the church member there are still other considerations which must not be lost sight of. We shall list also these very briefly.

1. The chief problem as far as the Church is concerned is the one inherent in a dictatorship. A dictatorship tends to be extremely nationalistic and hence totalitarian. Would the all-powerful state keep its hands off religion and the Church? We know that separation of Church and State is difficult to maintain even in a democracy. Would not this danger be enhanced under an authoritarian

government? And what would be the status of the Church under socialism? Would we be as free to operate as we are now? Would we, for example, be permitted to raise collections whenever we saw fit and for any cause we desired? Would we be allowed to send moneys out of the country any time we wished? Could we purchase any property we deemed adequate for our needs? Could we gather endowments and make investments of gifts? Could we carry on charitable endeavors, such as hospitals, old people's homes, and the like?

2. Christianity stresses the worth of the individual soul and its relation to God. All collectivism directs attention to the group and group life, and thus the emphasis is on externals. On account of constant regimentation the inner life of the individual is in danger of being more or less neglected.

3. Socialism lays stress upon material things. Economics is the all-important subject matter of thought, and thus the attention of the people is likely to be constantly directed to the here and now, to the neglect of things eternal.

4. Socialists are wont to promise the dawn of a golden age here on earth once their program is adopted. As Christians we should remember that "righteousness exalteth a nation." The welfare of society depends upon the moral fiber of its people. The solution of the problem of man's relation to his fellow man and the use of his earthly goods is real Christian stewardship. Whatever makes men good Christians also makes them good economists and useful members of society. By the preaching of God's Word we are instrumental in engendering a living faith in the hearts of the people, and thus we bring them to a realization that everything they are and have is attributable to God's grace and that all earthly goods should be used to His glory and the welfare of the neighbor.

#### **Totalitarianism with Special Rereference to National Socialism**

"Totalitarianism" as a term is of recent origin. Yet the idea itself is not new. Totalitarianism as we understand it today simply means that the state claims the right to dictate in *all matters* and to *control every phase of the life* of its people. The individual as such does not count. He amounts to something only in as far as he can contribute to the life of the state. In this respect he is like any member of the human body. A hand, for example, would only be harming itself if it refused to obey orders from headquarters. Alone and separate from the body, it really has no existence; it is absolutely worthless. And so with the individual member of the state. His whole being, his very existence as a human entity, is

wrapped up in the life of the body politic. Therefore he has no right over against the state. He cannot rise up and say: "This is something the state cannot do."

Mussolini defined the conception this way: "The Fascist conception of the state is *all-embracing*; outside it no human or spiritual value can exist, much less have value. Thus understood, Fascism is totalitarian, and the Fascist state — synthesis and a unit inclusive of all values — interprets, develops, and potentiates the whole life of a people." In his book *The Doctrine of Fascism* he says: "Political doctrines pass, but humanity remains, and it may rather be expected that this will be a century of authority, a century of the left, a century of Fascism; for if the nineteenth century was a century of individualism (liberalism always signifying individualism), it may be expected that this will be the century of collectivism and hence the century of the state. It is a perfectly logical deduction that a new doctrine can utilize all the still vital elements of previous doctrines.

"The foundation of Fascism is the conception of the state, its character, its duty, and its aim. Fascism conceives of the state as an absolute, in comparison with which all individuals or groups are relative, only to be conceived of in their relation to the state.

"The state, as conceived of and as created by Fascism, is a spiritual and moral fact in itself, since its political, juridical, and economic organization of the nation is a concrete thing; and such an organization must be in its origins and development a manifestation of the spirit. The state is the guarantor of security both internal and external, but it is also the custodian and transmitter of the spirit of the people, as it has grown up through the centuries in language, in customs, and in faith." (Pp. 451, 452.)

Hitler repeatedly spoke of the "Hingabe des persoelichen Daseins, des eigenen Lebens fuer die Gemeinschaft." "Alle Faehigkeiten," he said, "muss man in den Dienst der Gemeinschaft stellen, und das eigene Ich der Gesamtheit unterordnen, wenn noetig, auch zum Opfer bringen." (*Mein Kampf*, pp. 326, 327.) Even religion is subordinated to political power. "The state is regarded as the incorporation of the will of the people, centering itself in the responsible leader, and as such it is absolutely supreme in authority. In every field, including that of morals and religion, it speaks with the voice of God; it is God." (Haentzschel, *op. cit.*, p. 60.) From this it will be seen that totalitarian principles are the exact opposite of the ideals of a Christian *Weltanschauung* as well as of individualism and democracy. Perhaps we could say that totalitarianism is love and duty to country gone to the extreme, yea, to such an extreme that it is idolatrous, for to the totalitarian the state comes first at all times. It has usurped the place of God.

In order to make totalitarianism ring true, the leaders of these states insist that all members of the state must be imbued with the same spirit. There must be uniformity of ideals and *Weltanschauung*. If one believes one thing and the other something else, there cannot be a well-integrated organism, but rather strife and disunion. All will then not believe in and work for the same goal, namely, the glory of the state. As Hitler puts it, there must be "eine bestimmte, begrenzte, straff organisierte, geistig und willensmaessig-einheitliche politische Glaubens- und Kampfgemeinschaft." (*Mein Kampf*, p. 419.)

And the implication is that you are really a member of the body politic only if you accept this faith, otherwise you are outside the pale. This ideology must guide everyone in all walks of life, also the artist, for example. In the *Voelkischer Beobachter* (May 21, 1934) we read, "So long as there remains in Germany any unpolitical, neutral, liberal, or individualistic art, our task is not ended. There must no longer be a single artist who creates otherwise than nationally and with a national purpose. Every artist who withdraws from this preoccupation must be hunted as an enemy of the nation until he gives up his intolerable resistance." (Quoted in *Roots of Totalitarianism*, p. 28.)

From this it will be seen that totalitarian principles always imply a dictatorial form of government. This is necessarily so. The will of the State must become audible in some way, and that is only possible through the mouths of its officials; and since a number of the officials could disagree, it finally comes down to the decision of the one, the leader, the Fuehrer. In him the organism has its head. Parliamentarianism militates against the totalitarian idea because it must allow different parties and different opinions. Just for that reason Hitler and Mussolini insisted on one party and were so scornful of democracies. Totalitarianism will not allow "differences to be different."

As stated, the doctrine of totalitarianism is not new. What is modern is not its spirit, its creed, its world outlook, but rather the manner in which it applies ancient social principles to the conditions of a complex modern civilization. Actually the doctrine of the all-competent, all-embracing state is almost as old as human history. We know that in ancient civilizations the ruler was often looked upon as the favorite of the gods and demanded divine homage. Think of the Pharaohs of Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander the Great, the Roman Caesars. They were all deified. Indeed, the present Japanese emperor is still called the "Son of Heaven." In many instances, even among primitive peoples, there obtained hidebound customs and mores which left the individual

absolutely no freedom. His whole existence as a human being was wrapped up in the life of the tribe or the group or the nation.

In the time allotted we cannot of course trace the history of totalitarian doctrine in all its meanderings down through history, but a few highlights will not be amiss.

Totalitarians like to insist that Plato is one of the chief sources of their doctrines. Though Plato himself would probably object to this, for he did advocate a blending of the monarchal and the democratic form of government, there is much truth in the statement that Plato advocates a totalitarian order. In his *Republic*, for example, he adheres to the *organic view* of the state. He says, "Is not that the best-ordered state which most nearly approaches to the condition of the individual—as in the body, when but a finger of one of us is hurt, the whole frame . . . feels the hurt and sympathizes altogether with the part affected?"

*That simply means that the state is an individual.* As in the individual intellect, or reason, should rule over the emotions and passions, so in Plato's state the wise men, the philosophers, should be the rulers of the others. The state's main duty would be education. The prime minister would be none other than the minister of education, and the aim would be to develop the whole man in mind, body, and soul. The state would regulate the entire education of its citizens from the cradle to the grave. Therefore it would also make provision for religious ceremonies and observances. The rulers or guardians would also assign to each that place for which he is best suited, and he could not change. No group and no individual will then interfere with another. All will co-operate toward the general good, and harmony will reign supreme. That will be the perfect society, the just state; for "justice is the having and doing what is one's own," and a just man is a man in just the right place.

Besides this there would be strict eugenic laws, regulating the procreation of offspring so that the race may be improved. As in the breeding of animals, the best should be selected for mating. The better and braver should have as many sons as possible. Weak and deformed children should be left to die.

Furthermore, there would be laws regulating the economic activities of man. His patrimony could not be taken from him, he could not own more than four times what the poorest had, there would be no dowries at weddings, no lending money at interest. Even the minutest details would be controlled by the state, as for example, the eating of meals, traveling to a foreign country, the picking of fruit, yea, the number of guests that may attend a wedding. Plato expressly says, "I say who gives up the control of their *private* lives and supposes that they will conform to the law



in their common and public life is making a great mistake." (*Laws*, p. 780.)

The same idea of the state as an organism recurs repeatedly in the history of political thought. We find it in Thomas Hobbes in England, Jean Jacques Rousseau in France, and particularly in the writings of the German idealists Fichte and Hegel. Let us pause here for a brief review of the ideas of these two leaders of thought in Germany. We shall quote from a book entitled *Der Kampf der evang. Kirche in Deutschland und seine allgemeine Bedeutung*. (English title: *Cross and Swastika*.) The author is Dr. Arthur Frey, for ten years head of the Swiss Evangelical Press Service in Zurich. In a chapter on the Development of the National Socialist State he has this to say: "The exclusive authority of God, as it was proclaimed and brought to recognition by the Reformation, suffered in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries a gradual disintegration. God was anthropomorphized: He was put on a level with the human soul; He was seen in man; man was deified. In proportion as final exclusive authority was taken from God, secular power, particularly the state, assumed absolute authority.

"The German philosopher who evolved an absolutist political science was Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel. It was his belief that with his conception he was keeping strictly to the ground occupied by the Lutheran Reformation. He was grateful to the Reformation and glad that it broke up the unity of the Church and thereby helped the State to its power and dignity. Only by its crystallization in the course of history into a State does a people gather itself together for action and thereby come to consciousness of its freedom. This freedom is man's deepest being and, at the same time, his highest aim; and seeing that man achieves freedom in the State, Hegel can pronounce the remarkable opinion: '*Everything which man is, he owes to the State!*' Not merely is it, as the Reformers emphasize, that the State is an organization willed by God; Hegel expresses in the loftiest strains the deification of the State. 'The existence of the State is the work of God in the world.' The State is absolute purpose, 'the real God,' 'the Divine, existing in and for itself,' 'of absolute authority and majesty.' It is not possible to speak more absolutely of the State. With Hegel we already have the totalitarian State!

"For Hegel the State is in character completely religious. In the same way as the people, the State also has its roots in religion; but the people exist for the sake of the State and not the reverse. There is absolutely nothing which stands over the State. Hegel stresses with the greatest emphasis that the State stands above religion.

"Therefore Church doctrine also falls within the State's domain.

Everything has to subordinate itself to the State; even science and, along with it, theology, stand first of all at the service of the State. Within this limit they enjoy freedom. Thus with Hegel the State comprehends all the elements of life and in this way becomes the sum total of morality. . . .

"If with Hegel the State is the ultimate and the highest existence in the world, there crops up with other thinkers a new conception that is peculiar to the nineteenth century; it is the conception of the Nation. It became popular through Fichte's *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, which prepared the way for the German National State. 'Among all peoples you (the Germans) are that in which is contained most definitely the germ of human perfection.' He sees the German people as the sole modern people that can boast of a living speech of its own and that possesses a creative literature and science. It is the people of poets and thinkers and is called to be the 'regenerator and restorer of the world.' Fichte's belief in the German nation breathes a religious spirit. German nationality is to him something divine, no less than an organ through which the eternal spirit reveals itself. He sees the Fatherland 'under the image of eternity, and that the visible and sensible eternity.' Fichte founds a national mysticism; with him not the State, but the nation is divine. This national mysticism, or, to put it otherwise, mystical patriotism, has exerted a profound influence on the German people. Fichte recognized that man is willing to make sacrifices only for a religious cause, and therefore he proclaimed nationality as a gift of God, 'for which the man who is noble is happy to sacrifice himself.'" (Pp. 49—53.)

Many other writers could be mentioned here who, in a sense, prepared the way for the totalitarianism of Hitler's Germany. We shall call attention to just one more, namely Friedrich Nietzsche (1844—1900). Nietzsche seized upon the Darwinian doctrine of the "struggle for existence" and the "survival of the fittest" and developed this into a philosophy of the "will to power." "The will to live," he says, "is a will to power." "The rewards of the successful exertion of power are not false and evil, but real and good. Indeed, they are the only human goods." "This 'will to power' colors our thoughts. It gives us moral backbone. It inspires us to live dangerously. It gives us the guts to submit and suffer with gritted teeth when and where we must." "If a will to power beats at the heart of the world, it is natural, and therefore meet, right, and fitting that the race should be to the swift and the battle to the strong. The law of nature is, as Plato makes Callicles remark in the *Gorgias*, that the stronger should rule the weaker. The only morality sanctioned by nature is that *might is right*. [Emphasis our own.] In that case it is right that man should strive to make him-

self continuously more and more mighty and should breed a 'super-man' to inherit the earth. This can be accomplished only by freeing the 'few strong,' to use once more the Platonic phrase, from the 'many weak,' and by enabling them to exercise their natural right to dominate and rule the common herd.

"That, as matters stand, the race is not always to the swift or the battle to the strong is the fault of a perverted morality, for which Christianity is largely to blame. Christianity exalts humility, self-abnegation, pity, the sacrifice of the stronger to the weak. Such an ethics is 'Sklavenmoral.' . . . This must be swept away. The only true goods are strength of heart and strength of limb and power and splendor. These we must love and cherish and seek to build up in ourselves and in the race. The strong must take what they can. The weak must go to the wall, and suffer they must. The day of the superman is at hand, and we must prepare his way.

"Nietzsche's doctrines of the will to power and of the natural right of the strong to dominate the weak and his ethical ideal of the superman had a widespread and profound influence." (Fuller, *History of Philosophy*, pp. 562, 563.) — Dr. MacEachran of Alberta University stated some time ago that when he studied in Germany before the last war, he found, particularly among the students, many Nietzsche clubs and that these young people were fanatical adherents of the doctrine of power.

From all this it will be seen that there was a lot of Nazism in Germany long before Hitler ever appeared on the scene. Very few if any of the tenets of Nazi ideology originated with Hitler. What he did was to adopt and join together various ideas, promulgated by others at different times, into a philosophical system which he calls "die neue Weltanschauung der National-Sozialistischen-Deutschen-Arbeiter-Partei." In line with this, Nazism demanded a complete reorientation of one's view of life, a new way of regarding the world, a new interpretation of the meaning of life and the objects of national policy. Hitler emphasized this again and again. In the first chapter of the second part of *Mein Kampf* he says: "Es war selbstverstaendlich, dass die neue Bewegung nur dann hoffen durfte, die noetige Bedeutung und die erforderliche Staerke fuer diesen Riesenkampf zu erhalten, wenn es ihr vom ersten Tage an gelang, in den Herzen ihrer Anhaenger die heilige Ueberzeugung zu erwecken, dass mit ihr dem politischen Leben nicht eine neue Wahlparole oktroyiert, sondern eine neue Weltanschauung von prinzipieller Bedeutung vorangestellt werden solle." (*Mein Kampf*, page 409.)

And we might add that all the essential elements of this *Weltanschauung*, also those which are anti-Christian, are to be found in

*Mein Kampf*. It was often said that Rosenberg was the philosopher of the movement and that if one wanted to understand its philosophy one would have to go to his *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*. But in reality Rosenberg brought nothing new, though he did develop the paganism of the movement more fully.

Hitler emphasized the *theory of race*. This was really the fundamental basis of his whole system; and because he believed in it fanatically, it was the wellspring of all his actions. Many people lost sight of this fact and as a consequence failed to grasp the significance of the movement he inaugurated.

According to the theory there are lower and higher races among people, just as there are lower and higher species of animals. The elite among the races is the Aryan, though in *Mein Kampf* the word *Nordic* is used also, and one gains the impression that *Aryanismus* and *Deutschtum* are the same thing. All progress in the history of mankind, all its higher life, whether in the spiritual, artistic, or economic field, are the achievement of the Aryan race. If for some reason the Aryans would disappear, mankind would soon sink back into a state of savagery. The only hope for humanity, therefore, is the propagation and the maintenance of the superior race. It's all in the blood. If a person has that Aryan blood, he belongs to the superior race. It's of the greatest good to the world, therefore, that the blood remain pure, and hence it is the chief duty of the state (and this is a fundamental difference between Hitler's totalitarianism and that of others) to work for that goal. Mixing this elite blood with inferior blood is the greatest sin. Germany failed in the 1914 war fully to realize this race problem, and that accounts for her ultimate tragic defeat.

If we ask for the reason for this superiority, Hitler tells us it's not owing to the Aryan's greater will to live, but to his ability to see beyond his own nose, as it were, and realize the advantage of joining hands for the common good and, if need be, to sacrifice himself for it. This ability the Aryan has by birth. It's in his blood. The Jews are considered inferior, the very opposite of the Aryan, which view sanctioned their persecution. Here we have the explanation of the determined effort to increase the birth rate in Aryan Germany, accompanied by plans to provide sufficient *Lebensraum* for the growing Teutonic population.

Even the blind can see now what the theory of "race and blood and soil" implied. Hitler's constant appeal to nature was a reiteration of the law of the jungle, and a challenge to the whole spiritual structure erected by Hugo Grotius some three hundred years ago. Certainly the doctrine that "might makes right" could not be stated more crassly. At the same time, is it any wonder that the statesmen in other countries refused to take Hitler seriously? By

and large they considered his teachings just the rantings of a political orator, who would cool off if he ever got into power. We know now that they made a big mistake. The whole theory of purity of race is of course so much nonsense when viewed scientifically. Hitler and the members of his party adhered to it fanatically and acted upon it. The war therefore was more than a mere struggle for territory. What concerns us more vitally than the political implications is the fact that Nazi ideology struck at the very heart of Christian teaching. The *voelkische Weltanschauung*, as taught by Hitler and his party, was diametrically opposed to the Christian view of life, as must be evident to anyone who has given the matter even a little thought. It was simply pagan, plainly opposed to the will of God as revealed in His holy Word. Surely, it is not mixing Church and State if we expose the anti-Christian teachings of a powerful organization, no matter who its members are.

Our brief review of the world scene has not been too encouraging. We are living in times of strife and turmoil. As leaders in the Church it behooves us to be alert and to face the future with faith and courage. In a world of confusion we need not be confused. Our task is plainly outlined by the Lord Himself. We must go on preaching, teaching, serving. If we are faithful in that, we need not be dismayed, no matter how dark the clouds that appear on the horizon may seem, for we have the blessed Savior's assurance that He will be with us always and that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against" His Church.

Edmonton, Alberta, Can.

A. GUEBERT

---

### Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf an Orthodox Defender of Pietists

---

The Thirty Years' War, which had caused the Holy Roman Empire to disintegrate into several hundred little despotic states, virtually destroying the sentiment of national unity and creating a state of chaos in its social and economic life, was equally desolating in its effects upon religion. By way of contrast with this deplorable condition of the empire, France had its day of military and social glory. No wonder that for decades to come German men and women, disgusted with conditions in their homeland, were fascinated by the splendor of their illustrious neighbor across the Rhine. Under such circumstances it was only natural that religion, too, would be exposed to influences emanating from France. "Enlightenment" was the favorite watchword of that period.



Some of the German princes, like Duke Ernest the Pious, made an effort to stem the tide of religious indifferentism which threatened to engulf their states. Under the religious settlement of the Peace of Westphalia this was their privilege. Seckendorf tells us in the preface to his *Christen-Stat* that Duke Maurice of Saxe-Weitz would not tolerate atheists and despisers of religion at his court; but the very publication of this book shows that such persons appeared there. It was in the course of his discussions with people who held irreligious views that Seckendorf gathered the material for the first part of his book, which is against atheists. In praise of Duke Maurice the baron says that when he entered the latter's services as privy councillor and chancellor more than twenty years before, he found to his great pleasure that the duke not merely adhered to the outward form of worship, but according to all appearances also firmly believed the Christian truth; for the duke, he said, earnestly confessed it on every occasion and defended it according to his ability. The duke, however, as Seckendorf admits, was not a great scholar. This left the matter of Christian apologetics largely in the hands of his able privy councillor.

The situation at the ducal court suggested the writing of the *Christen-Stat*. In a letter to Leibniz, written in 1683, Seckendorf acknowledges his indebtedness to Pascal's *Pensées* for the idea of the *Christen-Stat* and introduces the name of Philipp Jakob Spener as one of those who encouraged him to proceed with this work.<sup>1</sup> Leibniz in reply refers to the prevailing impiety, especially at the courts, and explains why such a work produced by a man of Seckendorf's stature would be particularly influential in combatting it.<sup>2</sup>

The great German philosopher was not to be disappointed in the finished product. The *Christen-Stat* is not only an apology for Christianity, but a practical effort to raise the spiritual level of the Church.<sup>3</sup> The first part is directed against atheists; the remainder of the book is devoted to Christian exhortation and spiritual edification. Seckendorf has here assumed the role of a Lutheran bishop, issuing a pastoral letter for the spiritual welfare of his flock. His aim is to make of the people faithful and sanctified Christians; for he is convinced that as such they will be excellent either as rulers or as subjects, according to their respective stations. True citizenship he seeks in heaven; the earth is merely a miserable and temporary dwelling place.<sup>4</sup> Leibniz was delighted with it, considering it the best book of its kind in the German language. He wrote to Seckendorf: "I could not refrain from running through it at once from cover to cover, with the greatest delight."<sup>5</sup>

In the foreword to his *Christen-Stat*, as well as in the letter to Leibniz, Seckendorf mentions Spener. The latter, too, was profoundly distressed over the low ebb of spirituality within the Church, but — more than that — was also determined to do something about it. Philipp Jakob Spener, known as the father of Pietism, was one of the most remarkable personages in the Church of the seventeenth century. In his first charge at Strassburg he labored with such signal success as preacher and professor that within three years he received a call to become the senior minister at Frankfort-on-the-Main. There those who accepted his application of the Scriptures met with him in private for further instruction and strengthening of their spiritual life. Thus there originated in 1670 the *ecclesiolae* which were to become one of the distinct characteristics of Pietism. The first nine years of Spener's activity at Frankfort were generally peaceful. During this time he established his reputation as a loyal teacher and defender of the Lutheran doctrines. The calm was broken when, in 1675, he published his *Pia Desideria*.

The hostility aroused by these indeed sprang largely from the *collegia pietatis*, by which name Spener's groups of laymen for mutual edification became known, and was intensified when such meetings were inaugurated elsewhere. Theologically Spener followed the beaten path of the Lutheran Confessions. Where he parted from them, the deviation, as Albrecht Ritschl remarks, was quite concealed. His purpose was to improve the Christian life of the Church.<sup>6</sup>

In 1686 Spener received a call to Dresden. Some time before, when Lucius — the court preacher and confessor of John George III, the elector of Saxony — was dangerously ill, the latter had commissioned his privy councilor, Seckendorf, to inquire of Spener whether, in the case of a vacancy, he would be inclined to accept the position of court chaplain, and Spener had replied that he would if God so willed it.<sup>7</sup> In accepting the call to Dresden, Spener assumed what was considered the highest ecclesiastical post in the Lutheran Church of Germany. Seckendorf may not have suggested the idea of calling Spener to Dresden, but he persuaded him, when he was hesitant about going to Dresden, to accept the call.<sup>8</sup> The baron was being drawn into the stirring fortunes of the Pietists.

Spener came to Dresden with some apprehension; his misgivings were not to deceive him. He had indeed entered a larger field of activity but also one of combat. The Saxon clergy and some court officials soon adopted a course of systematic opposition to the new court chaplain.<sup>9</sup> Efforts were made to induce him to resign his pastorate, but this he refused to do. However, when

he received a call to the court of Brandenburg, he accepted it and, in April, 1691, removed to Berlin, where he served as consistorial counselor and provost of St. Nicolai Church.

In the same month in which Spener removed to Dresden (July, 1686) August Hermann Francke and Paul Anton inaugurated their so-called *collegium philobiblicum* at the University of Leipzig. After some time, however, the faculty, after a formal investigation, prohibited his lectures and forced Francke, together with Anton, to leave the city. Francke repaired to Erfurt, where he joined his friend Joachim Justus Breithaupt. On September 27, 1691, after only a brief ministry there, he was driven from Erfurt.<sup>10</sup>

But he was now to enter upon the richest period of his eventful life. He received and accepted a call to the newly founded university in Halle, first as professor of Greek and oriental languages and later of theology. At the same time he assumed the pastorate of the church at Glaucha, a suburb of Halle. Arriving in Halle on January 7, 1692, he opened there an era of Christian philanthropy which will ever remain an object of admiration to all who have a heart for the destitute.

Seckendorf had a hand in getting Francke to Halle, as he had in getting Spener to Dresden. On the first Sunday in Advent of the preceding year, Francke had preached for Provost Lütkens in Berlin. Seckendorf, who had just arrived in that city, persuaded the then all-powerful minister von Danckelmann to go to hear him. Von Danckelmann attended the service with a number of privy counselors. Having heard Francke, they resolved unanimously to retain him.<sup>11</sup>

Thus at various times and places Seckendorf is found involved in the affairs of prominent Pietists. The questions may then be asked: What was Seckendorf's relation with the Pietists? Was he one himself? How did Pietism, if at all, affect his writing of history? It is self-evident that a statesman whose activities took him to the various German states would have to come in contact with Pietists and could not avoid, at one time or another, having to deal with their program of proposed church reforms. Again, it must be remembered that he lived in the very age and area which produced Pietism. Gustav Kramer thinks that Pietism was the reaction of the Christian soul against the generally prevailing formalism and externalism of the ecclesiastical life. However, not all men who were interested in a functional Christianity joined the Pietistic movement.

In tracing Seckendorf's connection with the Pietists, one may begin with his attendance at the *gymnasium* in Gotha. The instruction which he there received in the years 1641 and 1642, according to A. Bräm, at that time already breathed the spirit of the

ideas and aspirations of a dawning Pietism, as they appeared in the *Schulbericht* of Duke Ernest the Pious.<sup>12</sup> Seckendorf, who had already been trained by his God-fearing mother to lead a sanctified life, freely imbibed the spirit of piety which prevailed in the company of such men as Reiher, Glass, and Bronchorst. Although Glass lived only to the beginning of the Pietist movement, he may be regarded in particular as of a kindred spirit to Spener. It should be remembered that Francke had also been a pupil of the pious pedagogs at Gotha. This may explain Seckendorf's sympathy with his pedagogical principles at Halle.<sup>13</sup> A. Tholuck speaks of the court at Gotha as "a Spener circle before Spener," but adds: "and yet not quite, for piety was still afraid to deviate by the breadth of a finger from the existing arrangements and traditions in doctrine and life, and believed that there were channels and means for the revival of the Church without any innovations in the constitution of the existing State Church."<sup>14</sup> At this point it may be well to remember that piety and what has become historically known as Pietism are not one and the same thing. It will not be possible to determine accurately how much Seckendorf was responsible for the spiritual and ecclesiastical conditions obtaining in Saxe-Gotha during his eighteen years of service there, nor how much the court of Ernest the Pious, or "Bet-Ernst," as he was also called, contributed to his spiritual development; but it is certain that Seckendorf continued to the end of his life to work for the kind of Christianity which was practiced at the Gotha court.

The beginnings of Spenerian Pietism are to be found in the period of Seckendorf's services under Duke Maurice of Zeitz. Three years after the publication of the *Pia Desideria*, Seckendorf seems to have come into more direct contact with Pietism for the first time. The wife of Landgrave Lewis VI of Hessen-Darmstadt was Elisabeth Dorothea, a daughter of Ernest the Pious. She brought to Darmstadt a measure of that devoutness and religious sincerity for which Duke Ernest and his pious councilor were known. Spener's ideas had been favorably received in Darmstadt and at first welcomed with enthusiasm by Dr. Balthaser Mentzer, but the *collegia pietatis* changed his mind. In January, 1678, he succeeded in persuading the aging landgrave to issue an edict forbidding them.<sup>15</sup> Just then Seckendorf came to Darmstadt. Spener feared that under those circumstances the baron did not get a good impression of him. He spared no pains to dispel any prejudices which Seckendorf might have against him, since he hoped that through the *patrocinium* of so dear a man in Saxony the suspicions which at that time were being spread about by his opponents might be effectively counteracted.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, the

Duchess Sophie Elisabeth, wife of Duke Maurice, may have contributed much to that end. She was the daughter of the duke of Holstein-Sonderburg and had as a girl attended Spener's *collegia pietatis* in Frankfort. Both Spener and Seckendorf praised the efforts of the duke and the duchess towards a functioning and practical Christianity.

Spener's first letter to Seckendorf is dated July 22, 1681. It cannot be definitely established what brought about this improved relationship between the two men. Seckendorf, on his part, mentions his acquaintance with Spener's writings. Spener's aims were too much like his own not to engage his interest; both strove for a practical Christianity. Already in his first letter to Spener, Seckendorf suggested that they discuss things "which redound to the glory of God and the welfare of the Church."<sup>17</sup>

The first specific subject of their correspondence was the improvement of the ministry. Both were convinced that the clergy were primarily to blame for the prevailing low state of the spiritual life in the Lutheran Church. Accordingly they thought it necessary to reach an agreement on how to raise the standards of the clergy. Seckendorf planned to support with practical measures Spener's efforts to reform from within. Persuaded that the academic life at the universities was not conducive to true spirituality, he suggested training the clergy in a special theological seminary and accordingly prepared a memorial, dated at Zeitz on February 11, 1680, to that effect. Spener approved the plan.<sup>18</sup> Nothing came of it, probably owing to the death of Duke Maurice and the chancellor's subsequent retirement to Meuselwitz. Unfortunately Seckendorf's letters from his correspondence with Spener, with one exception, have not been preserved. They must have been quite numerous.<sup>19</sup> Spener speaks of "*tot epistulae*."<sup>20</sup>

The ties binding the two friends were strengthened when Seckendorf in August, 1682, met Spener personally at Frankfort. It is quite probable that one of the subjects of their conversation was Spener's projected *Tabulae catecheticae*, which were dedicated to Seckendorf and published in the following year. On his journey from Frankfort to his new post in Dresden, Spener visited his friend at Meuselwitz. There Seckendorf was at leisure to concentrate on his program of reform, which in many ways closely conformed to Spener's. One result of his meditation on the ills of the estates and how to cure them has already been noted — his *Christen-Stat*. The similarity of the objectives of this book and the *Pia Desideria* leaves little doubt as to its influence in furthering the spread of Pietism. The Pietists were not slow to recognize in Seckendorf a champion of their cause. Spener quite naturally found in the *Christen-Stat* an arsenal for his own purposes; he



frequently quoted it with approval. He commended, for example, to a university what Seckendorf has to say about the need of studying the Scriptures.<sup>21</sup> Spener advocated returning the power of church discipline to the entire Church and was pleased to find that "in the Christian statesman's, Herrn von Seckendorf's, *Christen-Stat*" this right of the Church is so often defended.<sup>22</sup> In speaking of the difficulty of getting "truly converted and godly *Theologi*" for vacant pastorates, he referred to the recommendations of this "Christian *politicus*" in his *Christen-Stat*.<sup>23</sup> To support his claim that philosophy is harmful to the Church and true theology, he again cited the *Christen-Stat*.<sup>24</sup> Spener was pleased that Seckendorf included his opinion on excommunication in the *Additiones* appended to his *Christen-Stat*, though he also noted Seckendorf's opinion that the members of the Church must first be instructed how to use beneficially their right to excommunicate.<sup>25</sup> Seckendorf, on his part, showed the high esteem in which he held Spener by translating into Latin a number of his sermons which had been delivered in 1676 and 1677 and later published under the title: *Des tâtigen Christentums Notwendigkeit und Möglichkeit*.<sup>26</sup>

Seckendorf had hoped to find rest and quiet at his beloved Meuselwitz; but his connections with the leading public men in Church and State were too extensive and his domicile was too close to electoral Saxony for him to escape being drawn into the religious controversies of the time. During Advent of the year 1689, Francke, who had just been expelled from the University of Leipzig by its theological faculty, visited him at Meuselwitz. The baron had him preach for his resident pastor, M. Hermann, who was at the time a candidate for the position of court preacher at Zeitz. It is possible that Seckendorf considered Francke for the possible vacancy at Meuselwitz. At any rate, this visit may have laid the foundation for the affection which thereafter bound them together until the baron's death.<sup>27</sup> Spener likewise was Seckendorf's guest at Meuselwitz (July 3—6, 1691) on his way from turbulent Dresden to his new charge in Berlin.<sup>28</sup> No one was more competent to acquaint Seckendorf with the burning religious questions of that period than Francke and Spener; both were veterans directly from the field of combat.

Francke's troubles at Leipzig and Spener's at Dresden opened the floodgates for an outburst of controversial literature on the subject of Pietism. The most notorious of the many writings to appear in print was an anonymous one which originated in the orthodox camp. Johann Georg Walch ascribes it to Albrecht Christian Roth, pastor in Halle, who for a time was vesper preacher in the Thomas Church in Leipzig. Having been first

published in Latin, it is known as the *Imago pietismi*. Later it was issued in a German translation under the title: *Ebenbild der Pietisterey, die zwar lächerlich; doch vielleicht nicht wider Billigkeit also beniemet wird sich finden sollen*.<sup>29</sup> The *Imago pietismi* raises a number of accusations against Pietism, some of them being of a rather personal nature and directed against its spiritual originators and leaders. Having listed the abuses of Pietism in nine groups and its errors in eleven, the author comes to the conclusion: "Therefore Pietism thus described constitutes a sect which can be tolerated neither by the Church nor by the State."<sup>30</sup>

Such an attack could not go unchallenged. Various replies to its accusations appeared. The most noteworthy of these was that by Seckendorf, who from this moment is found to take an active part in the defense of the Pietists. Like the attack which it was to meet, Seckendorf's reply appeared anonymously, though no one seemed to doubt its authorship. The manuscript arrived in Berlin in January, 1692, bearing the title: "Bericht und Erinnerung auf eine im Druck lateinisch und deutsch ausgestreute Schrift, im latein *Imago pietismi*; zu deutsch aber, Ebenbild der Pietisterey genannt. . . ." <sup>31</sup> It cannot now be determined to what extent, if any, Seckendorf was actuated by any direct request from some higher authority to publish this apology. As a matter of fact, however, it appeared at a time most convenient for the Elector of Brandenburg to ward off any damage that the *Imago pietismi* might possibly do to the new university at Halle. Ernst Lotze, who has made a thorough study of Seckendorf's connection with Pietism, considers it unlikely that the baron — dignified, peaceable, and reserved as he was — would of his own accord have mixed into theological quarrels of such a "trivial" nature.<sup>32</sup> In Berlin, where the manuscript was censored and approved by the privy council, it was decided to withhold the author's name in order to avoid the suggestion that Pietism was being officially sponsored by the court of Brandenburg. Spener, who traced the history of Pietism from the disturbances at Leipzig to date in the foreword (dated: Berlin, February 16, 1692), did not hesitate to affix his name to it.\* Already on February 25 Spener was able to report to Francke that the printing was under way, but that it might still be eight days before the job would be finished. Speed was essential, for the plan was to present the apology to the ensuing diet at Dresden in defense of the Pietists, who were being subjected to serious criticism in electoral Saxony.<sup>33</sup>

Seckendorf's reply to the *Imago pietismi*, like all of his writ-

\* Spener named Seckendorf as the author in his *Gründliche Beantwortung*. In the second edition (Halle, 1713) Seckendorf is given as the author.

ings, is dignified and considerate. It reveals an intelligent grasp of the points of controversy. As the Jesuit Maimbourg's history of Lutheranism is presented and refuted section by section in Seckendorf's *Commentarius*, so the *Imago pietismi* is presented in sections ("Bericht"), and to each section is added the refutation ("Erinnerung").<sup>34</sup> Inasmuch as the author of the *Imago pietismi* challenged not only the Pietists, but also other "cordatos et historiae pietisticae gnaros," Seckendorf, as a "cordatus" and "honest" man, who is acquainted with some — and not the least — of those who have been attacked under the hateful name of Pietists, would disclose this or that in reply to it. Having in a thorough and objective manner examined the "abuses" and "errors" of which the Pietists had been accused, he reached the same conclusion as Spener in the foreword: Pietism is anything but a new sect or heresy. As such it is a mere fiction, a false rumor, for which the malice of certain theological circles and the ignorance of the stirred-up people are to blame; perhaps also the indiscreet forwardness of certain pietistically inclined people. Seckendorf professed his readiness to confer more explicitly with the author of the *Imago pietismi*, but in the spirit of the "Erinnerungen," of whose truthfulness and justice he was convinced. For his judgment was based, he said, on what he himself had seen and heard of those whom he considered innocent of the insinuations against them in the *Imago pietismi* — trusting that they were honest with him. Should they, on the other hand, have dealt treacherously with him and sooner or later have come forth with visions and fanaticism ("Schwärmereyen"), he would, with God, be one of the first to lament their deceit and regard them as such, as they should then in their guilt have revealed themselves.<sup>35</sup>

Seckendorf's apology did not fail to make an impression. The reading public quite correctly surmised who its famous author was. It was also honorably introduced by a highly respected personage — Spener. This eminent divine here for the first time stepped forth as the literary defender of Pietism. The pleasure with which Seckendorf's writing was received by the Pietists can readily be imagined. Spener, for his part, expressed the hope that it might appeal the more to all impartial thinkers, in as much as the author had no personal interest in the whole matter and had written merely for his love of the truth and the peace of the Church. He had a good reason for hoping this, for the accusations in the *Imago pietismi* were directed against him. Seckendorf had become a defender of Spener and his cause.<sup>36</sup> Soon he was to vindicate also his friend Francke at Halle.

Already in 1690 the Elector of Brandenburg, Frederick III — soon to become King Frederick I of Prussia — was thinking of

founding a new university in Halle. On June 30 the elector, who was then in Cleves, ordered the founding of the university, and on August 30, 1692, he issued a decree appointing Seckendorf as its first chancellor. It was significant that for intellectual leadership at the new school he selected men like August Hermann Francke, Samuel Pufendorf, and Christian Thomasius. The latter, like Francke, but not for the same reason, had been driven out of Leipzig. The resolution of the elector, to make Seckendorf his privy counselor and to place him at the head of the university in Halle as chancellor, fully demonstrated of what importance this institution was to become to Pietism. Seckendorf's call to Halle was, as Lotze points out, no less than a call to the battlefield of Pietist controversy.<sup>37</sup>

In a letter to Spener, dated Meuselwitz, May 30, 1692—the only extant writing of Seckendorf to that friend—the baron wrote: "Gott wird das Werk fördern, wo seine ehre durch mich alten schwachen mann annoch in einigen Dingen befördert werden soll; denn solchen Zweck suche ich, und finde sonst weder Ruhm noch Nutzen dabey."<sup>38</sup>

As chancellor, Seckendorf was to supervise both instructors and students, pointing out to each his respective duty. Once or twice a week he was to hold a meeting in his house or at the most convenient place, confer diligently with the professors, and faithfully show the students how to plan their studies and future journeys. And to the best of his ability he was to help establish good order at the university and cause it to flourish. The elector clearly showed in his commission to Seckendorf what he expected for his new school from a man with the baron's reputation and talents.<sup>39</sup>

Students were already arriving, and everything seemed ready for the beginning of instruction, when the faculty of the school and the ministry of the city became involved in a controversy which threatened the position of Francke at the University. The latter's strict church discipline as pastor at Glaucha incited some of his church members to bring complaints against him. His clerical opponents in the orthodox camp supported the dissatisfied laymen, and the strife was on. For once in his troubles Francke was to have the government on his side. His appeal for assistance met with a ready response in Berlin. Already on July 26, 1692, an electoral rescript created a commission to deal with Francke's difficulties. The members of this body were to be the chancellor of the university at Jena, who was to serve as chairman, the jurist Kaspar Kreuzing of Halle, and Seckendorf, who had previously gained some experience in a similar affair at Halberstadt. For some unknown reason the chancellor of Jena declined to serve.

This placed the chief responsibility in this matter on Seckendorf. The latter also spent the week of August 14 to 21 in Halle to prepare for his removal to that city and to act in Francke's case. On August 18 he gave Francke and his complaining parishioners a hearing. The next day he sent a report to the elector. With a clear understanding of the issues, he prevailed upon the elector to order a thorough investigation of all the questions involved and was thereby instrumental in obtaining for Francke a measure of consideration and justice which had been denied him in Leipzig and Erfurt. In response to Seckendorf's report the elector in September, 1692, issued a rescript which resulted in a fair trial of the case and the peaceful solution of the problems involved.<sup>40</sup> A new commission was appointed to act in the case. It consisted of the following members: Seckendorf; Dr. Lütken, the provost of St. Peter's in Berlin; and the Herren von Platen and von Diesskau. The sessions, held from November 18 to 27, were conducted with great deliberateness and care.<sup>41</sup> At their conclusion, Seckendorf drew up a compact of peace which was approved by the elector and ordered read from all the pulpits in the churches of Halle.<sup>42</sup>

Great was the joy of the Pietists, as well as that of Seckendorf, over the reconciliation of the estranged parties. Spener regarded it as "a special grace of God that preserved Herr von Seckendorf, when the stone had so weakened him, long enough to complete this task."<sup>43</sup> Indeed, this work of peace was to be Seckendorf's last. While he was still conferring with the elector regarding the establishment of the university, his old malady, the stone, cast him upon his bed for what proved to be his last illness. He died on the very day on which his compact of peace was read from the pulpits in Halle.<sup>44</sup>

The grief of the Pietists over Seckendorf's unexpected death was widespread and sincere, and rightly so. With his pen Seckendorf had appeared as a defender of Spener; with his prestige as a statesman and scholar he had prepared the ground for Francke in Halle, and as an arbiter had made it possible for him to continue his beneficent work there. No wonder that Spener lamented the baron's untimely death and that Francke mourned over it as over the death of a father. Seckendorf's death meant an irreparable loss to the cause of Pietism.<sup>45</sup>

The question whether Seckendorf himself was a Pietist is sufficiently involved to admit a difference of opinion. This question is a difficult one, because there is no simple criterion for reaching an all-embracing definition of Pietism or Pietists. Pietism was not the same thing at all places and during all periods of its development. The Pietism of Spener and Francke was not the same.



The definitions of partisans and foes have always differed widely. Preserved Smith flatly calls Seckendorf a Pietist.<sup>46</sup> Kurt Guggisberg, speaking of the baron's delight over the fact that the Protestant confessions agree in so many fundamental points, refers to him as one "in whom the Pietist aurora dawns."<sup>47</sup> Martin Spahn, however, intimates that not all who joined the Pietist movement were Pietists. Without any reflections on Seckendorf's motives, he says that not a few learned men drew near to the young community of Pietists, not only persons like the now aged Seckendorf, who within his limited sphere was still as busy as a bee and who was then writing his *Christen-Stat* (1685), but also such pugnacious natures as the Leipzig Christian Thomasius. However, he continues, quite soon it became evident that it was no longer religious sympathy, as in the sixties, which induced the leading intellects to join a religious society, but that, coincidentally, the enmity of the clergy against both groups occasioned the alliance. It is quite obvious that not all who co-operated with the Pietists or were even in sympathy with many of their aims need be classified as Pietists. If a religious liberal like Thomasius could sympathize with the Pietists, an orthodox Lutheran might defend them for very different reasons. Kolde asserts that it is scarcely permissible to call Seckendorf a Pietist.<sup>48</sup> Lotze agrees with Kolde. After a thorough investigation of the historian's connections with Pietism, he reaches the following conclusion:

Devoted to a living and practical Christianity, averse to separatism and mysticism, Seckendorf belongs to Pietism only according to one side of his being. Although his share in the Pietist movement is not a small one, we, too, do not number him with the representatives of a genuine Pietism, but, with Tholuck, place him in the ranks of the enlivening witnesses of the Lutheran Church of the seventeenth century — of those few but eminent and sympathetic personalities to whom we owe it that in a time of churchly decline the pulse of Lutheran doctrine and life did not stop.<sup>49</sup>

Of one thing there can be no doubt — of Seckendorf's fundamental orthodoxy. If, therefore, he himself was not a Pietist, he was most assuredly an orthodox defender of Pietists.

The question is now in order: How, if at all, did Seckendorf's intimate relation with the Pietists affect his writings as a church historian? It was to be expected that a widespread and dynamic spiritual movement such as Pietism would be revolutionary in its effect on historiography, as is evident in the case of Gottfried Arnold; but a study of Seckendorf's *Commentarius* bears out the correctness of Gustav Wolf's observation: "In his personal opinions Seckendorf already approaches closely to Pietism, but without

being directly influenced by it in the *Commentarius*." <sup>50</sup> However, the degree of objectivity attained by Seckendorf in his historical writings is a broad subject for another study.

Concordia, Mo.

L. W. SPITZ

#### REFERENCES

<sup>1</sup> Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Sämtliche Schriften und Briefe. Erste Reihe. Allgemeiner Politischer und Historischer Briefwechsel*. (3 vols.; Leipzig: K. F. Köhler Verlag, 1923—1938), III, 566 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 572.

<sup>3</sup> Seckendorf's *Christen-Stat* is reviewed in the *Acta eruditorum*, 1685, pp. 343—49.

<sup>4</sup> J. C. Bluntschli, *Geschichte des allgemeinen Staatsrechts und der Politik. Seit dem sechzehnten Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (2d ed.; München: Literarisch-artistische Anstalt der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1867), p. 134.

<sup>5</sup> Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *op. cit.*, p. 547.

<sup>6</sup> Albrecht Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus* (3 vols.; Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1880—1886), II, 125 ff.

<sup>7</sup> J. B. Trautmann and K. A. E. Kluge, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (3 vols.; Dresden: Justus Naumann, 1857), III, 276.

<sup>8</sup> Ernst Lotze, *Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf und sein Anteil an der pietistischen Bewegung des XVII. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pietismus* (Quedlinburg: H. Klöppels Buchdruckerei, 1911), pp. 28 f.

<sup>9</sup> Wilhelm Hossbach, *Philipp Jakob Spener und seine Zeit* (2 vols.; Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmler, 1828), I, 214 f.

<sup>10</sup> E. A. W. Krauss, *Lebensbilder aus der Geschichte der christlichen Kirche* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1912), pp. 603—5.

<sup>11</sup> Gustav Kramer, *August Hermann Francke. Ein Lebensbild* (2 vols.; Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1880), I, 102.

<sup>12</sup> A. Bräm, *Der gothaische Schulmethodus. Eine kritische Untersuchung über die ersten Spuren des Pietismus in der Pädagogik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Dissertation, Erlangen; Berlin, 1897), cited by Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 13. Lotze's book is the most authoritative work on the subject of Seckendorf's relation with Pietism.

<sup>13</sup> Lotze, *ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>14</sup> Quoted by Lotze, *ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>15</sup> Johann Georg Walch, *Historische und theologische Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten, welche sonderlich ausser der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche entstanden* (10 vols.; Jena: bey Johann Meyers Wittwe, 1730—1739), Parts IV and V, 1102—9.

<sup>16</sup> Philipp Jakob Spener, *Theologische Bedencken und andere briefliche Antworten auf geistliche/ sonderlich zur Erbauung gerichtete Materien* (4 vols., 3d ed.; Halle: in Verlegung des Waysen-Hauses, 1712—1715), III, 460.

<sup>17</sup> Lotze, *op. cit.*, pp. 24 f.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Theol. Bedencken*, IV, 526—35.

<sup>19</sup> Lotze, *op. cit.*, 25 f.

<sup>20</sup> Spener, "Foreword," *Tabulae catecheticae*, quoted *ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>21</sup> *Theol. Bedencken*, I, 398.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 613.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 651.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, 185.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 289.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Theodor Kolde, "Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf," *Realencyklopädie, für prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, ed. Albert Hauck, 3d ed., Vol. XVIII (1906): *Capita doctrinae et praxis christianae insignia ex 59 illustribus N. Test. dictis deducta et evangeliiis dominicalibus, in concionibus a. 1677, Francof. ad. Moen. habitis applicata a. P. J. Spenero 1689.*

<sup>27</sup> Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 37 f.

<sup>29</sup> Walch, *op. cit.*, Parts IV and V, 1149.

<sup>30</sup> Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

<sup>31</sup> Walch, *op. cit.*, Parts IV and V, 1151 f.

<sup>32</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41 f.

<sup>34</sup> The title page ends with the words: "Gedachte Schrift/ oder sogenanntes Ebenbild/ ist in gegenwärtigem Tractat von Wort zu Worte stückweise eingerückket/ die Beantwort—und Erinnerung aber mit andern Litern darunter gesetzt/ zu befinden." Quoted *ibid.*, pp. 42 f.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 43 f.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 44 f.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 59—63.

<sup>41</sup> Kramer, *op. cit.*, I, 115.

<sup>42</sup> Rambach (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 311.

<sup>43</sup> *Theol. Bedencken*, III, 721.

<sup>44</sup> Rambach (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 311. Kramer, *op. cit.*, I, 117.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Lotze, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

<sup>46</sup> Preserved Smith, *A History of Modern Culture* (2 vols.; New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930—1939), II, 242.

<sup>47</sup> Kurt Guggisberg, *Das Zwinglibild des Protestantismus ein Wandel der Zeiten* (Leipzig: Verlag von M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1934), p. 89.

<sup>48</sup> Theodor Kolde, "Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf," *Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche*, ed. Albert Hauck, 3d ed., Vol. XVIII (1906).

<sup>49</sup> Lotze, *op. cit.*, pp. 87 f.

<sup>50</sup> Gustav Wolf, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte* (3 vols.; Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1915—1923), I, 10.

## The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer

### The Seventh Petition

Ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. But Deliver Us From Evil.  
Matt. 6:13; Luke 11:4.

Jesus acknowledges the existence of evil and the reality of deliverance from it. Since the Father is to be implored, it follows that there is deliverance with Him and that He is not involved in, but ever opposed to, the evil. The Deliverer is mightier than the evil. This petition would have no purpose if His children were not

exposed to the evil, to its influences and effects. Jesus introduces three factors: the Father, His children, and the evil. The evil is aggressive, God's children are endangered, and the Father is the Defender and Deliverer.

Man, without understanding and vain in his imaginations, professes to deliver himself from evil by the denial of its existence. To him evil is evil only when it is so interpreted. An example of such deliverance is the following: "The intellectual realities, such as all the qualities and admirable perfections of man, are purely good and exist. Evil is simply their nonexistence. . . . In the same way, the sensible realities are absolutely good, and evil is due to their nonexistence. . . . It is possible that one thing in relation to another may be evil, and at the same time, within the limits of its proper being, it may not be evil. Then it is proved that there is no evil in existence; all that God created, He created good. This evil is nothingness; so death is the absence of life. When man no longer receives life, he dies. Darkness is the absence of light: When there is no light, there is darkness. Light is an existing thing, but darkness is nonexistent. Wealth is an existing thing, but poverty is nonexistent. Then it is evident that all evils return to nonexistence. Good exists, evil is nonexistent." (*Some Answered Questions Collected and Translated from the Persian of Abdu'L-Baha* by Laura Clifford Barney. Bahai Publishing Committee.) Thus also other cults and imaginations interpret the Seventh Petition to mean: Deliver us from the absence of good, and from that which does not exist! Yet they recite this petition in their meaningless prayer. They would save themselves from evil by evil doctrine.

Not all unbelievers deny the existence of evil. Those who acknowledge its reality define it as the negation of good, the opposite of goodness, the morally bad, the positive effects of extrinsic negative elections. They deplore its power and destructiveness. They seek deliverance from it by education and training, by laws, by appeals to the intellect and to the emotions, by improvement of social conditions. These attempts rest on the presumption that man's intellect (Greek philosophy) and sensibilities (Roman philosophy) are intrinsically good. Through all the ages the Modernists will regress without exception to the one or the other formula, modified ad libitum. Their prayer is: Grant that our conduct may conform to our inner perfection of attitude and knowledge, that so our virtues may react victoriously over all imperfections of individual and social thought and life for the advancement of personal and general happiness. Thus the poor world, as it lies in wickedness, encourages suffering humanity to counteract recognized evil by imbibing hidden evil.

The particle ἀλλά, which introduces this petition, does not advance a new thought. It serves as a copulative and appends to the former petition an accessory plea, an adversative. Whether we retain the usual translation of "but" or render it, with equal emphasis, by "yea," a contrast is expressed in either case. The petition simplifies the definition of the evil: Evil is that from which the Father must deliver us.

The concept of evil as an oppressive and burdensome weight is suggested by the εἰσφέρειν in the Sixth Petition and the ῥύεσθαι in the Seventh. For εἰσφέρειν means to carry into, and ῥύεσθαι with ἐκ means to carry away out of, or from under, with ἀπό to carry away from. The evil, therefore, is an overwhelming force, or forces, threatening to crush us.

As we, in retrospection, survey the antitheses of all former petitions, we arrive at the conclusion that the evil is the aggregate of everything, of every being, power, and state, opposed to the substance of our prayer.

Luther says: "Hier bitten wir, dass er uns erloese von dem peinlichen Uebel, als die Hoelle ist, und alles, was uns am Leibe wider ist und uns bekueummern mag, auch von dem urspruenglichen Uebel der Suende, als die Lehrer sprechen, damit wir nichts anderes denn Uebeles wollen; dass er uns davon loese, auf dass die Begierde des Fleisches nicht gefangen nehme den Geist, als St. Paulus zu den Roemern, Kap. 7:23, sagt. Nun lasst uns eben merken, wie wir bisher gebeten. Wir haben Gott in den ersten dreien Bitten seine Ehre gegeben; in den andern um unsere Not gebeten, was uns vonnoeten an Leib und Seele, dass er uns unsere Suende vergeben wolle; und nun, zum allerletzten, bitten wir, dass er uns vor dem Uebel bewahre. . . . Die ersten drei gehen Gott an, die andern drei uns, von den Suenden, auf dass wir gottfoermig moegen werden. Und wenn diese alle also geschehen sind, so sollen wir bitten: Nun erloese uns vom Uebel. Also sind alle Gebete und Notdurft hierin beschlossen" (St. L., VII: 750 f.).

The verb ῥύεσθαι, to draw, to draw to one's self, to rescue, to deliver (Thayer; G. Milligan; also Benseler and Schirlitz; E. E. Seiler on Homer: to draw and carry out of danger), etymologically conveys the idea of haste and speed, as that of a swift and rushing current. Indeed, we ask the Father to rise to His power in our behalf and to make haste (הֵרָחֵק) for our help, for the enemies are lively and strong (Ps. 38:19-22). Luther translates ῥύεσθαι by the word "deliver," but he makes it imply also the thought expressed in the words "graciously take us to Himself." It is stronger than the word "defend," and it calls for quick action to save to the utmost and entirely.

To know the evil from which we ask deliverance, we need only



consult the references in which the verb λύομαι is used. These are the following: Matt. 6:13 (apo) and Luke 11:3 (apo): from the evil; Matt. 27:43; Luke 1:74 (ek): out of the hand of our enemies; Rom. 7:24 (ek): from the body of this death; 15:31 (apo): from the disobedient; 2 Cor. 1:10 (ek): from so great a death; Col. 1:13 (ek): from the authority of darkness; 1 Thess. 1:10 (apo): from the wrath to come; 2 Thess. 3:2 (apo): from perverse and wicked men; 2 Tim. 3:11 (ek): from persecutions and afflictions; 4:17 (ek): out of the lion's mouth; 4:18 (apo): from every evil work; 2 Pet. 2:7: from the filthy conversation of the wicked; 2:9 (ek): out of temptation. The prepositions *apo* and *ek* are used with λύεσθαι, the former in five references, the latter in seven. In connection with this verb, *ek* means from within, indicating that we are surrounded by the evil, while *apo* refers to the contact and power, or the grip, which the evil endeavors to maintain on us.

Faithful and serious-minded pastors are painfully touched by the plight and distress of their co-laborers, and they grasp at once at what comfort there is in the knowledge that the same afflictions are accomplished in their brethren. No less than six references arranged above are written by St. Paul and allude to his personal and official experiences with the evil. In Rom. 7:24 this great brother complains bitterly that he is an evil to himself, inasmuch as his flesh will not yield to the Spirit, and he cries out as in agony: Τίς με λύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; In Rom. 11:26 he calls Jesus ὁ Ὑψόμενος, and in the passage before us he rejoices in triumph: "I thank God through Jesus Christ, our Lord." His own flesh, his own sinful nature, is an evil from which the pastor cannot extricate himself. He must pray that the Father may deliver him and his brethren (ἡμᾶς) from his own body of this death often during the day, and as often he will glorify the Deliverer.

In 2 Cor. 1:10, Paul describes to his readers the danger of inevitable death which encompassed him and his companions, and out of which (ek) the Lord delivered him. In this instance he treats death as an evil, as likewise in 2 Tim. 4:17 (cf. Ps. 22:21; 57:4) the danger of death, referring rather to the circumstances, while elsewhere he welcomes death as a blessing. Persecutions and afflictions, from which (ek) the Lord had already delivered him, 2 Tim. 3:11, he includes in "every evil work," from which (apo) the Lord will finally deliver him by granting him a blessed end. Twice the holy Apostle refers directly to the children of the world as an evil which troubles us and from which (apo) the Lord delivers us that we are not contaminated. In Rom. 15:31 Paul speaks of unbelievers in Judea, and in 2 Cor. 3:2 of unreasonable and wicked men from whose repulsive and deceitful presence we seek deliverance. As we read the context of 1 Cor. 1:10, 2 Thess.

3:2, Rom. 15:31, we are impressed by the power of prayer for deliverance by the Father's favorable answer to the sincere intercession: Deliver us (ἡμᾶς) from the evil. We as Christ's ministers and stewards, exposed and sometimes subjected to the evil, should never fail to beseech our charges to pray for us. And we should pray with them and for them: Deliver us from the evil.

Another review of the circumstances attending Paul's struggles with the evil proposes the question whether Luther derived his classic classification of the evil from the study of these passages, himself under the strain of the same experiences (2 Tim. 3:12; 1 Pet. 5:9) as preacher and pastor; for he suggests that we pray for deliverance from every evil of body and soul, property and honor, and an unhappy death.

Luther rather broadened the text, if τοῦ πονηροῦ is to be taken as the masculine. We quote: "Here again there is an elaborate debate on a comparatively unimportant question. The probability is in favor of the masculine, the evil one. The Eastern naturally thought of the evil in concrete. But we as naturally think of it in the abstract; therefore the change from the A. V. in the R. V. is unfortunate. It mars the reality of the Lord's Prayer on Western lips to say: Deliver us from the evil one. Observe that it is moral evil, not physical, that is deprecated." (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*.) Robertson (*Greek Grammar*) does not decide the issue. "With masculine adjectives the substantives naturally suggest themselves out of the context or the nature of the case. Cf. . . . probably τοῦ πονηροῦ (Matt. 6:13)." "In Matt. 6:13 ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, most likely διάβολος is meant, not mere evil" (pp. 652 f.). We quoted Luther's view above. If we understand the article of τοῦ πονηροῦ to be emphasizing the universality and multiplicity of evil, then we find cause and effect included in "the evil." The *Expositor's Greek Testament* advances in favor of the substantive, and then in favor of the adjective, an argument outside of the text and context and outside of Scripture, namely, the difference in the trend of Eastern and Western thought, as noted above. G. Milligan writes in *Vocabulary VI* under πονηρία: In the VI/A.D. amulet, BGU III. 954:24 (*Selections*, p. 134), the phrase in the Lord's Prayer is cited as ὁὔσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πονηρίας, which some may be tempted to quote in support of the A. V. of Matt. 6:13." "We pray in this petition, as the sum of all, that God would deliver us from every evil." The Evil One, Satan, is the prime cause of all evil, but now not the only source and cause. We reiterate the statement that the evil is that from which the Father must deliver us. We repeat that the evil, according to the context, is every force opposed to the answer and realization of any or of all the former petitions. We observe that all other petitions refer to no persons directly except

to the Father and His children, and consistency and conformity urges us to discard the masculine of τοῦ πονηροῦ. We note that πονηροῦ is related to πειρασμόν as the general to the specific, in the very substance of the petitions. And we compare the preposition ἀπό (and ἐκ elsewhere) used with ῥύεσθαι, and the double εἰς in the Sixth Petition, to state that while temptation to evil is limited to certain boundaries, our contact with the evil is not limited to the experiences with the personal devil. Τοῦ πονηροῦ is all-inclusive. — We are not at variance with the Large Catechism, which says: "In the Greek text this petition reads thus: Deliver or preserve us from the Evil One, or the Malicious One; and it looks as if he were speaking of the devil, as though he would comprehend everything in one, so that the entire substance of all our prayer is directed against our chief enemy. For it is he who hinders among us everything that we pray for: The name or honor of God, God's kingdom and will, our daily bread, a cheerful conscience, etc. Therefore we finally sum it all up and say: Dear Father, pray, help that we be rid of all these calamities. But there is nevertheless also included whatever evil may happen to us under the devil's kingdom — poverty, shame, death, and, in short, all the agonizing misery and heartache of which there is such an unnumbered multitude on the earth" (*Trigl.*, 729:113 ff.) Whatever starting point we may choose, τοῦ πονηροῦ as masculine or as neuter, we arrive at the same substance of the petition, and all speak the same thing; for we have found no expositor who does not "finally sum it all up" or treat the term as collective, including the innumerable personal and impersonal evils arrayed against the children of God.

The evil is not an edifying theme. The thought of it is depressing, and the fact of it is terrible. Where the good ceases, there the evil begins. Without evil in and about us this earth would be the narthex of heaven. Through sin this world is the home and playground of all evil. Sin and the devil constitute the greatest evil. Sin challenges and forces into action the eternal laws of God's justice and subjects the sinner to God's righteous punishment now and in eternity. Therefore the concepts of sin and evil often meet and concur, as in Prov. 11:19. Evil already at its birth is saturated with the poison from which it dies.

The contemplation of our deliverance from the devil and all evil by the Father's grace and power is most edifying. The Petition proves that God only can deliver. To Him only do we pray. Christ's work of redeeming us from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil is the earnest of our deliverance from all evil. The tense of the Petition (aorist) reminds us that God's acts of delivering us correspond in number and frequency to the evils that befall us. They are always of such power and kind as the

counteroffensive demands to accomplish our rescue. It is much, therefore, that we beseech the Father to do for us. How great and mighty is our God! His defending and saving capacity is unlimited. Either He takes us away from the evil, or He removes the evil from us, or He eases our burden. And He can manage the uninterrupted answer to this petition for each and everyone according to the petitioner's need. The Father knows the evil, as well as His own resources for our deliverance, better than we do. Nor does He ever underestimate the power of evil. The Lutheran pastor therefore believes that "im Vater Unser legen wir unzählige Teufel darnieder und verschlingen die ganze Welt in einem Gebet" (Luther, St. L., II:62), and that he has omitted nothing in the presentation of his need of deliverance.

Luther classifies the comprehensive term as every evil of body and soul, property and honor, and of death. This order covers the other range: evils of childhood and youth, of manhood and old age; evils of personal, common, and temporal, of spiritual and eternal, of financial and moral, significance. The Litany (*Lutheran Hymnal*, p. 111) enumerates many evils in a similar order. The evils may be classified also as of the past, the present, and the future.

Unless the pastor's body is "kept under" (1 Cor. 9:27), it becomes an instrument of evil and an object against which he and we must pray. While it is kept under to obey the law of the Spirit (Rom. 7:22), to be presented to God a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1), and to be dedicated as the temple of God and His instrument for good, it is yet subject to vanity (Phil. 3:21) and at times passes through days of evil. Then the pastor sighs the complaint of Job (Job 7), which is a long paraphrase of our petition; but he also sings Job's Psalm of Life and Deliverance (Job 19:23-27). No pastor is excluded from the sufferings of Christ or from the comfort of Christ (2 Cor. 1:3-6).

In his poor and vile body that may, besides, be burdened with ill health, the pastor's soul is ever alert and busy to serve the Lord with gladness and to pasture the flock faithfully. Yet he himself may be assailed by doubt and vexed in the spirit within himself (Rom. 7:24). He is still a wretched man, but without ceasing he prays to be delivered from the evil attributes of his own soul and mind, from false doctrine moving in his thoughts. And praying for the safety of his body and soul, he opens the Bible for wisdom and strength to meet himself in combat, that the spirit may conquer the flesh. The pastor also knows that God is in earnest when He admonishes us to duty in Ezek. 33:1-9. Not the ninety and nine whom he has gained, but only the blood of Christ can deliver the pastor's soul from the guilt of having lost by negligence the one hundredth soul. O Father, deliver us from every evil of the soul!

What, by comparison, is earthly property and temporal possession but an handful of sand! The pastor has that share of it which he can call his own, treasures on earth exposed to moth and rust, to fire and flood, to thief and robber. These treasures the Father protects and blesses to the welfare of the pastor. The dangers threatening the possessor as such and his possessions constitute the evil of property (Prov. 30:7-9). The pastor who prays this Seventh Petition will be on guard against the love of money and the things of this world.

The pastor's honor and reputation is to him of greater value and importance as ambassador of Christ than all the riches of this world. Because he is a Christian pastor, his good name is often "appointed to destruction" by Christ's enemies, and sometimes careless members, misunderstanding their pastor's motives, judge him harshly and uncharitably circulate false reports about him. In the experiences of persecution by the tongue the servant is not above the Master. The evil reports may linger in the mouth of the pastor's survivors. On the other hand, he will subdue his pride if he feels desirous of posthumous fame. Why does he want to be remembered by posterity? It is enough that the Lord has written his name in the Book of Life. It is more than enough that the gracious Savior will remember the pastor and his faithfulness over little things. And without the pastor's effort, He has provided for His undershepherd's posthumous fame: Remember your leaders who *spoke* to you the Word of God, Heb. 13:7. Hence the pastor need do nothing about his honor and reputation but deserve it by his faithfulness and pray that the Father may preserve his good report in life and after death against the vile mouth of slanderers.

And finally the pastor's last hour comes. He knows not when, where, or how; but the Lord will be his Guide even unto death (Ps. 48:14). He was going home all along, and now he is at heaven's door. In death he fears no evil. The Lord is with him. A farewell to those who will follow later: "And now, brethren, I commend you to God and to the Word of His grace." There may be some physical pain, and there may be a bodily struggle, before Elijah's chariot bears the happy soul to heaven, where the Father is. Once more and at last: Our Father, deliver us from the evil, and take us to Thyself in heaven! Then the divine miracle of grace: the life of Jesus is made manifest in the pastor's mortal flesh even at his death! He does not see death. He shall never die. He is delivered from all evil. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." And a humble soul, grown footsore in the paths of his Master as he hopefully followed on in the course the Savior was leading, now leaves his earth to this earth, his ashes to other ashes, his dust to be mingled with dust and buried to



coming ages. But his soul triumphantly rises by faith in Christ's gracious pledges on to another day, to the day of joy everlasting. Then also his crumbled earth, his very dust and his ashes, united again with the soul, will rise in glory resplendent and bear the reflection of Him who saves us from every evil and exalts us to beauty unseen, to bliss beyond comprehension, to peace no mortal now feels, to life that never expires. It is fitting that the pastor's mortal remains should be robed in the vestment in which he preached the deliverance from all evil through Jesus Christ, the Lord of Life, and that a palm leaf be laid on his casket as a symbol of victory. *Liberatus ab omni opere malo, dormit secure in manu Iesu.*

Los Angeles, Calif.

G. H. SMUKAL

---

## Sermon Study on 2 Cor. 5:1-10

---

### Eisenach Epistle for the Sunday after Christmas

This text is taken from that section of the Second Letter to the Corinthians in which Paul describes "the glory of the Apostolic ministry: human weakness permeated and transfigured by the power and glory of God" (Bachmann), 3:1—6:10. Human weakness (cp. 4:7-12, 16, 17; 6:4-10); God's power and glory as manifested in the Gospel (3:1—4:6; 5:11-21), and changing weak human beings into unconquerable heroes of faith (4:7-18; 6:1-10). Therefore "we" in our text refers primarily to the incumbents of the ministry of Jesus Christ, the Apostles and their associates, such as Timothy, named 1:1 in the superscription, and Silvanus (1:19), one of Paul's assistants. Yet Paul does not mean to say that the precious truths expressed and the experiences described by him pertained exclusively to pastors and preachers. No, they apply to all who like Paul and Timothy and Silvanus are believing children of God, whether Apostles and preachers or not. What glorifies and transfigures their human weakness as ambassadors for Christ (5:20) is the very same power and glory which permeates and glorifies and transfigures every Christian's life, spent in the weakness and frailty of human, earthly existence. While this text is particularly appropriate for a pastoral sermon, in the Sunday sermon the preacher will naturally apply its truths to all the hearers directly.

V.1: "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." The Apostle had spoken of his mortal flesh (4:11); of death working in him (v.12); of the perishing of his outward man (v.16). What perishes is his mortal

flesh, his body, in which death works, that body in which he bears about the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in his body (4:10). In this our mortal flesh, in this our dying body, the life of Jesus is made manifest, which life, inherent in our body as living water, flows forth from our mortal body into your hearts to give you life, true life, spiritual life, eternal life working in you (v. 12). Note the continued emphasis on the weakness of the *body*, the earthen vessel (4:7), in which he has the marvelous treasure described (4:1-6). And this earthen vessel, his body, is now called "our earthly house of this tabernacle." The body is called a house, οἰκία, a dwelling, since it is the habitation of the soul, which was breathed into the lifeless body (Gen. 2:7). This house is defined by the appositional genitive as a tabernacle, a tent, σκῆνος,<sup>1</sup> just as Peter calls his body "this my tabernacle," σκηνώμα (2 Pet. 1:13, 14), again emphasizing the weakness and frailty of the human body, stressed so frequently in the preceding chapter. It is called "earthly," ἐπίγειος, the Greek term designating not the material out of which man was made, but the place, earth, on which (ἐπὶ) he lives and to which locality his body is adapted. Paul now posits a possible eventuality in full keeping with the frail nature of the body and the nature of things visible in general (4:18 b): "if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved." Καταλύω means to destroy, demolish. It is also used of taking down a tent, so that it no longer serves as a dwelling. This dissolution takes place at death; when man's body according to God's decree returns unto the ground out of which it was taken, dust unto dust (Gen. 3:19). Ἐάν with the aorist subjunctive is used to designate the condition as undetermined, though with a prospect of fulfillment. The subjunctive designates the fulfillment as possible and even probable but always leaves an element of doubt hovering in the mind of the speaker. This suits exactly the case of the Apostle and his fellow workers. They expect to die, for that is the lot of all human beings. Yet the Apostle knew of another possibility, which he had clearly stated in his first letter to the Corinthians, written less than a year prior to the second. He had revealed to them a mystery: "We shall not all sleep (die); but we shall all be changed" (1 Cor. 15:51). And since there might be for him also the possibility to be among those who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord (1 Thess. 4:15), he does not state positively that his body will be dissolved into dust and ashes.

<sup>1</sup> In profane and Biblical Greek ἡ σκηνή is never used to designate the human body as the tabernacle of the soul. While τὸ σκῆνος is almost exclusively used in this figurative sense, τὸ σκηνώμα is used in profane Greek almost exclusively in the literal sense, in LXX and Acts 7:46 also of the Temple; in New Testament (2 Pet. 1:13, 14) and ancient Christian literature apparently only figuratively of the body.

Yet if his body will succumb to death before the glorious Day of the Lord, he is not on that account despondent. The destruction of the body is not a destruction of himself, but a demolition only of the tabernacle, the dwelling in which he lives so long as he is on earth. He himself survives the destruction of his earthly tenthouse. And he will not forever be without the body, without a dwelling. The destruction by death is not an annihilation. "We know that we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," so he triumphantly exclaims. That is not a guess, not a theory, not an uncertain hope. We *know*, that is the divinely created knowledge and conviction of faith (cp. Heb. 11:1). We have a building, an edifice, "of God," ἐκ, out of God, proceeding from, originating in, God; a "house" in which we shall dwell just as we dwelt in our body; yet a house "not made with hands." Heb. 9:11. Human bodies are brought into existence by the Lord through the human agency of parents, and they are flesh born of the flesh, sinful, corruptible, mortal. This body is eternal, incorruptible, unaffected by the passing of years, timeless. Our present body is "earthly," yonder body is "in the heavens," adapted to heaven and its heavenly life as our earthly body was adapted to earthly life only, not being able to inherit the incorruption of the heavenly kingdom of God (1 Cor. 15:50). This body we "have," ἔχομεν, the present tense. Not as though already in this life there were implanted in our body a resurrection germ at Baptism or in the Lord's Supper. Nor does the Apostle mean to say that at the moment of death there will be given to us an immaterial body, a shadowy form, betwixt and between the earthly and the heavenly body. Nor does the present tense, "we have," of necessity state that this body is already prepared for us, is being reserved in heaven to be handed out to us as a glorious garment on the Last Day. And, finally, the present tense does not oblige us to identify this "building of God" with the heavenly bliss into which the soul enters at death. The ἔχομεν, "we have," is simply the futuristic present occurring so frequently in the apodosis of conditional sentences using εἰ with the aorist subjunctive. (Cp. Matt. 5:46, 47; 8:2; 18:12, 13; Luke 15:8, 9; 1 Cor. 7:39, 40; etc.) This construction of using the present in the apodosis is especially appropriate here, since Christian faith is the substance of things hoped for (Heb. 11:1). We have not yet in our possession that body which will be ours in the resurrection, the resurrection body, of which Paul writes (1 Cor. 15:42-54). What we have now is the corruption, the frailty, the dishonor of a natural body. That body is sown as it is; and this selfsame body will be raised (Job 19:25-27; John 5:28, 29; 1 Cor. 15). But it will be raised a changed body, as a body transformed into the likeness of the glorified body of our Lord

Jesus; or this transformation will take place in the twinkling of an eye in those who live to see the Day. And this glorious house is not made with hands. That we have not inherited from our parents. That is purely from God, purely heavenly, a miracle possible only to the Lord of Life, a product solely of His power and grace in Christ Jesus.

Vv. 2, 3: "*For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that, being clothed, we shall not be found naked.*" The καί, omitted in A. V., adds another thought, which the γάρ denotes as more closely defining the resurrection body. It is, namely, one for which we sigh while in this tabernacle, an edifice out of heaven. Ἐν τούτῳ, viz., σκηνῇ, cp. v. 4: "we that are in the tabernacle," and the fact that in v. 2 also the resurrection body is called a "dwelling."<sup>2</sup> While dwelling in our earthly tent, we sigh, "earnestly longing to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." In v. 1 it was called a building, οἰκοδομή, stressing its construction, an οἰκία, emphasizing its purpose. In v. 2 it is called an οἰκητήριον, a habitation, a house to live in, in which we shall dwell. It is described as τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ; hence it cannot be heaven itself, but one originating in heaven, coming as it does ἐκ θεοῦ, from God (v. 1). We earnestly desire, we long "to be clothed upon" with this house. To understand these words, we must revert to 1 Cor. 15:52-54. There the Apostle had described the change which the believers living to see the Last Day will undergo. "This corruptible must put on incorruption; this mortality must put on immortality." The Apostle uses the word ἐνδύσασθαι. The middle voice usually must be translated "to clothe oneself," yet since if one has clothed himself, one is clothed, the middle is used in the passive sense in a number of passages where the idea of clothing oneself is out of question. Compare Luke 24:49, where the A. V. renders very properly the middle by "be endued." Just as surely the middle is used in the passive sense in 1 Cor. 15:53, 54 and 2 Cor. 5:2-4. The dead certainly cannot clothe themselves with incorruption and immortality while they are dead. Nor do they clothe themselves after they have been brought to life, they are raised incorruptible. They have "put on" incorruption and immortality only because God has clothed them with immortality and glory in the exact moment of their vivification. The same act called "putting on," ἐνδύσασθαι (1 Cor. 15), is designated in our text (vv. 2, 4) as ἐπενδύσασθαι, "being clothed upon," in order to distinguish it from ἐνδύσασθαι, used in the sense of "being clothed"

<sup>2</sup> Some interpreters regard "in this" as the object toward which the sighing is directed, this object being specified either by the participial clause, v. 2, or the εἴγε clause, v. 3. Yet the direction of sighing is indicated either by ἐν or by a participial clause as here, never by ἐν.

in our mortal body (v. 3). The Apostle changes the figures. What was called building, house, habitation, is now viewed as a garment, because the Apostle is not thinking of an actual house, but of our body in which we dwell, or in which we are clothed now, and which we put off in death in order to be clothed upon with the resurrection body. This clothing upon must not be thought of as putting on one garment, one body, over another; so that in heaven we would have two bodies. No, this corruption must put on incorruption, and that very act of being clothed upon with incorruption strips off all incorruption, changes completely our vile body (Phil. 3:21). This change will not be a matter of hours, or even minutes, one imperfection gradually disappearing after the other. Those that had died before the Last Day will be raised incorruptible. Those that are still living will be changed in a moment (1 Cor. 15:52). To them this lightning change will happen while they are living, without having been obliged to taste the bitterness of death or to face the certainty that their body will disintegrate into dust and ashes.

Now the Apostle in v. 3 makes a statement which has proved a puzzle to many. Farrar in *The Pulpit Commentary* refers these words "to those whom at His coming Christ will find clothed in these mortal bodies, and not separated from them" (hence not naked, γυμνοί, unclothed) "i. e., quick and not dead (1 Thess. 4:17; 1 Cor. 15:51)." He continues, "This seems to be the simplest and most natural of the multitude of strange interpretations with which the pages of commentators are filled." We agree with him.<sup>3</sup> Paul assures us that he and his companions while in their mortal body sigh, longing to be clothed upon with the resurrection body, if so be that they will be found also clothed, alive in their body, not unclothed, dead. The Apostle does not say positively that he will be found alive, but the entire connection expresses his desire to be found so on the Last Day rather than to be unclothed, disembodied, before that Day arrives. In the next sentence Paul adds (καί) an explanation (γάρ), clarifying the meaning of the sighs and longing.

V. 4: "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." "We that are," and as long as we are, ὄντες = durative participle, "in the tabernacle," the body, sigh, "being burdened" with all those trials mentioned (4:8-12) and to which he again refers (6:4-10; 11:23-33). He had felt the working of death in his own body (4:12), and that was not

<sup>3</sup> The only reasonable objection would be the ἐνδυσάμενος if translated "having put on," since we did not put on our physical body. But we have seen that the aorist middle in 1 Cor. 15 and 2 Cor. 5 is used in the passive sense of "being clothed."



a pleasant sensation (cp. 1:8-11). Knowing the agony of death by these personal experiences, together with his companions he sighs, groans. The burden of their sighs is stated in the next clause introduced by ἐφ' ᾧ, here used, as in Rom. 5:12, in the sense of ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι, because, since. They do not wish or will "to be unclothed," "naked" (v. 3), disembodied in death, but their will is to be robed with the resurrection body while still alive, so that mortality, τὸ θνητόν, that which is mortal, might be swallowed up completely, thoroughly, by life, not a whit of mortal remaining, every form of death having been swallowed up. Compare 1 Cor. 15:54, where the same word is used after the process of swallowing up had been described as a robing, putting on (v. 53), and a changing, transmutation, of the believers, whether dead or alive (vv. 51, 52).

Such longing is not unworthy of the Apostle nor of any believer. It does not flow from weariness with life. It is not at all on a line with Elijah's petition (1 Kings 19:4) or with Jeremiah's vehement complaint (Jer. 20:14 ff.). Elijah desired to die, and Jeremiah wished that he had never been born. Paul longs to live on and to labor on, joyously, loyally doing the Lord's work, and then, while in the midst of activity, behold the Lord's coming and experience that quick glorious change from mortality and frailty and sinfulness to perfection and power and immortality. Neither Elijah's petition nor Paul's longing was fulfilled.

What Paul here expresses is that natural dread of facing death which caused even Jesus to exclaim: Luke 12:50; 22:42; cp. Heb. 5:7. There is not a Christian to whom the consciousness that the night of death is coming closer is not fraught still with many an anxious thought, who is not anguished at the thought that sooner or later his body and soul will languish in the icy grasp of death, and who will not in such moments exclaim with the Apostle, "We would rather not be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

V. 5: *"Now He that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit."* This swallowing up of death by life, so utterly beyond human understanding that it is denied and ridiculed and regarded as a crazy notion (Acts 26:24), is nevertheless a glorious fact. Man can destroy, and his power of destruction has increased horribly during the last decade. But man cannot bring back to life anything that has by his own or any other agency been dissolved in death. This is possible only to God. With superb skill the holy writer brings out this fact. The copula is dropped and in the very center is placed God as on an exalted throne, flanked on the one side by an act of omnipotence in the past, and on the other by a guarantee of everlasting grace for the future. In the past He has "wrought

us," thoroughly prepared us by hard labor, for the resurrection unto life. That was hard work, costing God His own Son, costing the Son the agony of being forsaken of God, costing Him infinite patience and tireless seeking and inviting until He had won us as His own. Yet God did not rest until He had finished His work on us, that labor of everlasting love begun in eternity. Note the three composite verbs with *κατά*, denoting thoroughness. Death is thorough in his work of dissolution until man is unrecognizable (v. 1). Life is even more thorough in swallowing up, annihilating all that is mortal (v. 4). And God is divinely thorough in preparing us completely so that we may be fit for the robes of resurrection. God, being God, does what He undertakes thoroughly. Not only has He provided for us in the past, but He provides thoroughly for our future. He has given us the earnest of the Spirit. The genitive is appositional, defining the earnest as consisting in the Spirit. The earnest money is the first payment as a pledge binding one to fulfill all obligations. Man may treacherously, for various reasons, renounce his pledge. God is God, unchangeably truthful, the God of the Amen (Is. 65:16; 2 Cor. 1:20). We were made temples of the Holy Spirit by God's omnipotent grace transferring us from spiritual death to spiritual life. Can there be any doubt that He is able to effect for us also the swallowing up of mortality by life? God being the unchanging God of everlasting faithfulness, need there be any question of His willingness to do what He has pledged to do by giving us His Spirit as an earnest? Surely our hope for the resurrection body is based on an unmovable foundation.

And now the Apostle makes the proper application of these glorious truths.

Vv. 6-8: *"Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight); we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord."* Vv. 6-8 form a complex sentence of which v. 8 is the principal clause, the first word of which resumes in the indicative the first participle, *θαροῦντες*, of the two subordinate participial clauses (v. 6). V. 7 interrupts the smooth connection between 6 and 8 by a parenthetical statement. "Therefore we are" (rather "being therefore") "always confident." In view of what has been stated in the preceding context, all being the work of God, who should not be confident having such a God as his own? (Cp. *Lutheran Hymnal*, 423, st. 5.) The Greek term for being confident, *θαρέω*, denotes a state of confident and courageous cheerfulness, sometimes stressing the confidence, sometimes the cheerfulness, sometimes the courage. It is used by Christ and the Apostles invariably to denote that specifically Christian confidence and courageous cheerfulness based on the conviction of God's grace in

Christ Jesus.<sup>4</sup> We are "always" confident. Oh, yes, there were in Paul's life, as there are in the life of every Christian, periods of depression and downheartedness (cp. 2 Cor. 1:8; 2:4; 7:5; 12:7, 8, 15, 20, 21; Gal. 4:11-19). Yet those were passing moments. No trial, no sorrow, no heartbreaking experience could extinguish that deep-seated courageous confidence and cheerfulness engendered by the knowledge of Christ, His Savior.

Another participle follows, adding another fact influencing the inner life of the writer. "Knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." Ἐνδημέω, to live among one's people, to be at home, present; ἐκδημέω, to be separate from one's people, away from home, absent. As long as we are in our bodies as in our earthly home, we are away from home, absent, from the Lord. In order to prevent any misunderstanding, as though the writer meant to doubt or deny the constant fellowship of the believer with Christ, who has given His promise Matt. 28:20, an explanatory statement is added in the form of a parenthesis.

"For we walk by faith, not by sight" (v. 7). "Sight," εἶδος, invariably denotes the outer form, the external, visible appearance of a thing. Yet the English version, while not literal, correctly renders the idea. "By," διὰ, is here used of an area, a sphere, a state, or condition, through which one passes, the state or area being defined by the genitive. We are walking through the area, or on the way, or in the sphere, of faith, and not in the area of visible forms and manifestations. Faith is not seeing, even though it is assurance and conviction (Heb. 11:1, 13). As long as we are at home in the body, that corruptible mortal flesh and blood which is unfit for our heavenly heritage (1 Cor. 15:50), we are away from that state in which we shall see Christ, in this sense away from Christ, away from our true home which He has prepared for us (John 14:2), into which He will receive us (Heb. 9:28; 1 Thess. 4:17).

V. 8. "We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." Though we are not yet walking by sight, though we still are away from Christ, yet we are confident, of good cheer, in good spirits, and this cheerful confidence of an everlasting union with Christ is manifested by the fact that although we would personally rather live to see Christ's coming, yet we are well pleased, we are perfectly willing, rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord. "With," πρὸς, face to face, as the Word is "with" God (John 1:1); as the Lord spake to Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend (Ex. 33:11), while to other prophets, though as really and

<sup>4</sup> Christ uses this term Matt. 9:2, 22; 14:27; Mark 6:50; 10:49; John 16:33; Acts 23:11; Paul uses it 2 Cor. 5:6, 8; 7:16; 10:2. It occurs also in the Letter to the Hebrews (13:6); in 2 Cor. 10:1 it is used by the opponents of Paul in the sense of a boaster's futile claim to courage.

actually present with them as with Moses, He spake only in visions and dreams, not in visible form and appearance.

To be at home with the Lord — what a joy! To be face to face with Him whom we loved and longed for, though we saw Him not — what ecstasy! To behold Him with our eyes and see Him as He is, whom we could see here only in His Word as through a glass darkly, whom we could know only in part, to know Him perfectly, to see Him and bask forever in the sunshine of His unclouded grace — what heavenly, unspeakable bliss!

Paul had experienced a brief foretaste of this bliss (2 Cor. 12: 1-4), and this brief vision only increased his longing to be forever with the Lord. So overwhelming is the bliss of heaven that the very thought of it causes him to forget his dread of death and the hopeful desire to remain alive till Jesus comes. He has learned from the Savior to pray: Not my will, but Thine be done! If God wills that I remain till that Day, I shall be pleased. If He wills that in addition to the many deaths I have undergone (4:11, 12) I finally meet the grim foe face to face and undergo the painful parting of body and soul, the slow disintegration of my mortal home, well and good! I am not only ready, I am well pleased with His will, for then I shall be finally at home, forever with the Lord! Not the manner of arriving there, by being unclothed or by being clothed upon, is after all the thing that matters. The only thing that really concerns me is to be at home with the Lord.

And now Paul draws the practical conclusion. V. 9: "*Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of Him.*" "Wherefore we also labor." Καί adds another verb to "we are of good courage" and "we are pleased": "we labor." That is the biography of a Christian: confidence in Christ; submission to His will; glad service. Labor, φιλοτιμούμεθα, to love one's glory, to seek one's honor, to be ambitious. Man's ambition naturally is centered upon himself, his own glory, the satisfaction of his own desires, the gratification of self-chosen pleasure, the fulfillment of his own will, the realization of his own plans. Paul's ambition is diametrically opposed to that. His sole ambition is centered upon Christ and His commendation. The honor he loves most, the glory he cherishes above all, is to be accepted of Him, εὐάρεστοι, well pleasing to Him. Oh, may this my glory be that Christ is not ashamed of me, that He is pleased with all I do! For this purpose he had cast away honor, prestige, his own righteousness, everything that men count worth while (Phil. 3:1 ff.), and here, in view of what Christ has done for him and will grant to him, he repeats his solemn vow: to let his sole glory ever be and remain to please Christ. And then the question whether that day shall find us at home in the body or absent from the body, alive or dead, dwindles into insignificance.

Though the name of the Christ Child is not once mentioned in this text, it is a very suitable text for the Sunday after Christmas, the last Sunday of the year. The pastor may call attention to *The Wonderful Blessings the Christ Child Procured for Us*. (1) Now we know that we have a home in heaven. (2) Now we can willingly bear our burdens. (3) Now we can labor joyously to please Him. — Or: *The True Christmas Spirit*. (1) Joyous hope of an eternal home (vv.1, 2). (2) Willing commitment of our times into Christ's hand (vv.2-8). (3) Firm determination to please Him (v. 9). — *We Have an Eternal Home in Heaven*. (1) That is our assured conviction (vv.1-5). (2) That is the object of our longing (vv.2-8). (3) That is a constant impulse to loyal service (v. 9). — *The Christian's Longing for Home*. (1) Its glorious object (vv.1-4). (2) Its firm foundation (v.5). (3) Its blessed fruits (vv.6-8). — *Let Us Thank God for Christian Assurance!* (1) This upholds us in life and death. (2) This makes us fruitful in good works. — One often hears the term *Weltanschauung*, world view. That is usually restricted to affairs of this world. The Christ Child makes all things new. *The Christ Child Gives to the Believer a New Outlook*. (1) On life. (2) On death. (3) On eternity. On life, since the Christian no longer regards the life lived in the body, nor the body lived in this life, as the chief thing. Though in this world, he is otherworldly. His body is but the tabernacle of his soul. He longs to be with Jesus and seeks to please Him in all he does. On death, since death is no longer a terror to him, but though death and its preceding burdens cause him to sigh, they are but a gateway to Jesus. On eternity, which is not a nirvana, a bodiless existence, something to be dreaded. In eternity body and soul will be re-united; the body will be glorified; soul and body will be forever with the Lord. — This last part could be expanded into a sermon on *The Christian's Glorious Resurrection Hope*. —

The last Sunday of the year reminds the Christian of the rapid flight of time, the decay of all things, his own death, the approach of endless eternity, his own sinfulness. With the burden of sin he flees to his Savior, knowing that to this day, to the end of time, in eternity the message of 2 Cor. 5:18-21 remains true. And with all other disturbing and harassing thoughts and worries on this last Sunday *We Flee for Refuge to the Manger of Bethlehem*. There we find (1) comfort in the burdens of life; (2) peace when the dread of death and eternity oppresses us; (3) strength to strive above all to be accepted of Him.

THEO. LAETSCH





## Outlines on Gospels Adopted by Synodical Conference

### Twenty-Fourth Sunday after Trinity

Mark 8:34-38

The human body is accorded a high value by both God and man. The Lord reminds man in Scripture that he is created in the divine image (Gen. 1:27) and that the bodies of Christians are temples of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:20). Most people value the body highly and devote much thought to its nourishment, care, and health. The medical profession enjoys universal esteem. What about the soul?

#### The Value of the Soul

1. *As estimated by man*
2. *As estimated by God*

#### 1

a. There are those who question the existence of the human soul. Many ancient and modern philosophers think that man is all matter, *e.g.*, Epicureans in the days of Paul (1 Cor. 15:32). Throngs today live only to pander to lusts of flesh, as though there were no soul or life after death.

However, man is not all matter. He is body and soul (Matt. 10:38; Job 14:22); and the soul is immortal (Eccl. 12:7).

b. Others, admitting existence of soul, put a low price on it, because the body has to them a higher value (Luke 12:20; 16:19 ff.; Ps. 127:2; Matt. 6:25 ff.). Many of them are out to gain the world or a sizable portion of it (v. 36 a; 1 Tim. 6:9). Also nominal Christians minister to the life in the body first and hope that somehow in the end their souls will be saved. No man, apart from the enlightenment by the Gospel, puts the true valuation upon his soul.

c. The result: loss of the soul. Losses always affect men adversely; loss of the soul brings damnation. Of those who are ashamed of Christ and His words He will also be ashamed on that Day (v. 38), that means, eternal damnation (Ps. 49:16-20).

#### 2

God's estimate of the soul differs totally from that of man.

a. (Vv. 36, 37.) God regards the human soul so highly that nothing on earth can equal its value. No man can gain the whole world, but if one could, yet all the world with all its fabulous riches is worth less than a human soul. If, therefore, man's soul is lost in sin and under Satan's rule, then all human efforts to redeem it must fail (Ps. 49:7, 8). To what lengths have men gone to obtain peace of conscience! Penances of heathen, of Popery, etc.

b. That which is impossible to men is possible with God. He ransomed the human soul (1 Pet. 1:18; 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23; 2 Pet. 2:1; Rev. 5:9). So highly does God estimate the souls of men that

He does not deem the sacrifice of His own Son too great a price. Such a price is not paid for anything of trifling value.

c. If God estimates the human soul so highly, how eagerly should people lay hold of salvation by faith in the Redeemer (Acts 2:37, 38; 1 Tim. 2:6; Acts 10:43; 1 Cor. 6:20). Conscious of his royal dignity, how gladly should the redeemed Christian take up his cross, the shame of the Cross of Christ, and all suffering that may follow. Even if it cost his life, he would save it (v. 35 b).

d. The high value God places upon a reclaimed soul is apparent from the blessings He bestows upon it: peace (Rom. 5:1); comfort in sorrow (Rom. 8:28 f.); glory and joy of heaven (Rom. 8:18; 2 Tim. 4:8). On the great Day, Jesus will not be ashamed of His cross-bearers, but will confess them before the Father and all angels.

LOUIS J. ROEHM

### Twenty-Fifth Sunday after Trinity

Matt. 13:44-52

How blessed the lot of the citizen of the United States of America! Living in a country far from the havoc of war's destruction, in a land blessed with unlimited resources and rich in opportunity, he is a most fortunate individual. But more blessed than the most prosperous American is the Christian, rich in the treasures and resources of heaven. Hence

#### The Blessed Lot of the Christian

1. *He is fabulously rich*
2. *He will escape the destruction of the wicked.*
3. *He has the joy of sharing his riches with his fellow men*

#### 1

A. V. 44. "It was customary of old to divide one's possessions into three portions: the first for the needs of the family; the second for the emergency of flight; and the third for laying away in the earth. Hence treasures of no mean value were unexpectedly unearthed. Near Sidon, natives found several boxes of gold coins, bright like new, dating from the days of Philip and Alexander the Great; in India, English soldiers raised from a well money valued at \$1,531,250; and in 1906 there was found in Turkey an iron pot containing twelve hundred silver coins. Palestine was reputed to have hundreds of such hidden treasures. Jer. 41:8; Job 5:21; Prov. 2:4." (*Hom. Mag.*, Vol. 52, p. 388.)

*Application:* Many Christians are like the man of our parable. Though they have never sought after Christ (Rom. 10:20; Is. 65:1), when they have come to realize what a precious treasure the Gospel is, they regard it as the most valuable discovery of their

lives. Sir James Young Simpson, the discoverer of chloroform, when asked, "What is your greatest discovery?" replied, "My greatest discovery is that I am a sinner and that Jesus Christ is my Savior." Do we always regard the knowledge of God's loving favor in Christ as that important?

B. Vv. 45, 46. "Diamond cutting was an art still unknown in those days. . . . Pre-eminence was given to the pearl. . . . Fabulous sums were paid for unique specimens. Caesar gave to the mother of Brutus a pearl worth \$240,000, and the famous pearl which Cleopatra dissolved at a feast and drank to the health of Mark Antony had an estimated value of \$400,000." (*Hom. Mag.*, Vol. 52, p. 393.)

*Application:* Many like the pearl connoisseur of our text seek for the truth as a precious gem and, when they have found it in the Gospel of Christ Jesus, are ready to sacrifice every other treasure for it: the disciples (Luke 5:11, 27, 28); Paul (Phil. 3: 7-9); Luther (*The Lutheran Hymnal*, 262:4). Do we appreciate the Gospel that much? (Matt. 10:37-39; Luke 14:26-33.)

## 2

A. Vv. 47-50. "The dragnet was . . . sunk to the bottom of the sea by pieces of lead fixed to the nether side, and on the upper side portions of cork kept the net upright in the water. It was drawn forward through the waters, enmeshing good and bad . . . fish in one broad sweep." (*Hom. Mag.*, Vol. 52, p. 395.)

B. *Application:* While the lot of the wicked on this earth often appears very similar to that of Christ's followers or even better than it (Parable of the Tares; the Rich Man and Lazarus), a great difference will be evident on the Day of Judgment when the Christians will escape the dreaded lot of the damned (v. 50; Matt. 8:12; 24:51; 25:30; Luke 13:28). Do we appreciate this?

## 3

V. 52. *Application:* This parable urges upon all of us to share our treasured Gospel, ever presenting "old truths in new forms," for a Christian who has "understood these things" (v. 51) cannot but share his spiritual blessings (Matt. 16:25; 1 Cor. 10:24; Matt. 25:35-40). Do we, according to our abilities, provide our fellow men with the Gospel synodically, congregationally, and personally?

*Conclusion:* How often we have failed to appreciate our great wealth in Christ and our final deliverance! How seldom we have shared our spiritual riches! And yet for Jesus' sake God has not imputed these sins against us. He has not removed from us the treasures of His Gospel. May we then with thankful hearts appreciate our blessed lot and share our joys with others.

THEODORE F. NICKEL

**Thanksgiving Sermon****1 Kings 5:4, 5**

Thanksgiving Day, a day on which a whole nation annually is directed by the heads of the government of nation, state, and city to go to church, to thank God for His blessings, is definitely a good American custom. Other nations have observed such days for special occasions, but no nation has done this for so many years.

America has every reason to observe Thanksgiving Day each year. Our country is richly blessed. Enumerate the blessings of field and forest, of mine and oil wells, of freedom and liberty. We as American citizens have the right of free worship, the boon of equal opportunity for all. These things were true also in 1945, but this year we have special reasons to celebrate Thanksgiving, as urged upon us in text.

**Two Special Reasons for Thanksgiving**

1. *The Lord, our God, hath given us rest on every side*
2. *Now we may devote ourselves more fully to the task of building God's house*

**1**

A. Context, 1 Kings 5:3 b. The era of David had been an era of war. David was a fighter, a warrior king, nearly throughout his reign. 1 Chron. 22:8. He fought with Goliath, against Saul, against heathen nations, against his own son Absalom.

B. Wars were also about us on every side during the last ten years. War in China, war in Spain, war in Europe, war in foreign lands, wars all about us. On Dec. 7, 1941 (Pearl Harbor), we were as a nation drawn into the bloody maelstrom of war with all its horrors and dreads, unrest and anxiety, dangers and death. Total war raged in hitherto unknown fury for nearly four years, but now: text, v. 4.

C. Special blessings of peace. Described in text as "rest." War is a time of great unrest, anxiety, care. Peace brings rest. Removes much of the hurry, strain of war. Has done this even now. This is a special reason for thanksgiving in 1945, special reason for gratitude to God. Text, v. 4 a. Cf. Is. 2:4; Hos. 2:18.

D. On this Thanksgiving Day of 1945 we should not hesitate to give credit to our leaders — governmental and military. Name such leaders. We should be thankful to our men of science (radar, etc.), thankful especially to our soldiers and sailors, who have borne the brunt of battle. We do not wish to minimize the effort of men in bringing war to a successful close. We should not hesitate to be thankful for them today and also in the future. Especially, how-

ever, thank God today for giving our land victory, peace, and rest. Ps. 46:8, 9.

E. God was the real cause of victory and peace in David's and Solomon's day. God was real reason for victory and peace in our day. Give evidence. Who gave unusual weather at Dunkerque for evacuation? Who kept Japanese from following up advantages of Pearl Harbor? Who led Hitler to attack Russia rather than England? Who sent fog to keep Remagen Bridge from destruction? Only answer is: "God." This is answer of our text (v. 4). It is the answer of the Bible.

F. To God all praise and glory. Ps. 115:1; Ps. 107:1, 2. Surely one big reason for Thanksgiving Day, 1945, is God's wonderful blessing of victory and peace. But we have another reason for real gratitude on this day. After dreadful era of destruction we now can devote ourselves more fully to building, building of God's house.

## 2

A. Situation in David's Day. David was eager to build God's house, but 1 Kings 5:3 a; 1 Chron. 22:7, 8, 9.

B. War period of destruction. Destruction of many churches. Give examples. Many congregations were scattered in China, Poland, Finland, Germany. Also here in our country, war effort interfered with Church. Migration of war workers, etc.

C. Text, v. 5. Now peace — now many congregations can build churches and schools. Situation in St. Louis. Ten congregations plan to build churches and schools. Ten mission chapels are to be erected in Western District alone. Give examples of building plans in your own city or District.

D. Now in days of peace we shall be building houses of the Lord, but not merely houses of wood and stone. The real temple of God, the Church can now be built in a new and better way. Glorious mission opportunity at home and abroad. Thank God for setting before us an open door. "Come, let us build," slogan of Peace Thankoffering, can now be fulfilled.

E. On this Thanksgiving Day we should thank God that he has given us the men and the means of carrying out great program of building. 273 chaplains and service pastors will return to civilian life. All potential kingdom builders. P. T. O. was a remarkable outpouring of gifts. Latest estimate, September, 1945: \$5,661,700. It may reach total of \$6,000,000. All this is definitely a blessing of God, for which we should show gratitude in word and deed.

F. Final appeal to consecrate ourselves anew to God and to pledge ourselves on this Thanksgiving Day to become real temple builders in era of peace.

E. L. ROSCHKE



**Twenty-sixth Sunday after Trinity****Luke 19:11-27**

This nobleman is Christ Himself. — Originally God had created men to live in His world below and later to remove them to glory. Man spoiled this plan of God; by sin he left God's kingdom and became a subject of Satan. Christ came, delivered us from the kingdom of darkness, and restored His kingdom on earth. Then He went to receive for Himself the Kingdom of Glory and in His time to return again. In the meantime we remain here in His kingdom on earth; and for our guidance He leaves us the command:

**Occupy Till I Come****1**

To whom does He give this command? To His servants only. — There are others — citizens, but rebellious. He does not at once reckon with them; that He postpones until His return. Israel was for a time His elect nation; but they turned against Him. Many today who are not Israelites after the flesh belong to that tribe, do not acknowledge Him as King, or only do so as a matter of form while they are disloyal. With them He will deal when He returns, v. 27.

But He has loyal servants. These He has chosen from the great mass; brought them to the knowledge that He is their Savior and King (called them by the Gospel, etc.). He not only makes them His servants; He equips them for efficient service; gives them capital for their use: knowledge of His Word, ability to apply it; gifts of body and mind; property, position, influence; patience, tact, courage, bravery, strength to suffer. Every servant receives such gifts; Christ forgets no one. Not all the same (Matt. 25:15); but in the end they are of equal value, 1 Cor. 12:14-25; Rom. 12:4-8. The Lord gives them all, and it is for no man to say which is greater and which less.

**2**

Only to His servants, but to all of His servants, He gives the order: "Occupy till I come," — take care of My kingdom, do business for My kingdom till I return.

They are servants, workers — no drones, no "ladies" or "gentlemen" in Christ's kingdom. Not slaves, who do what they do unwillingly, by constraint; but they remember what He has done for them, what they have received from Him, and they cannot help doing willing service. Yes, there is a wicked servant who took all he could get, wrapped it in a napkin, and hid it in the ground; and in the end the Lord got no return on His investment; but he was only a sham servant.

With their gift the servants are to do business for the Kingdom, work to maintain and build it (spreading the Gospel by personal mission work; supporting ministers and teachers; home and foreign mission; taking active part in congregational life; their very life a sermon to those who are outside).

The Lord wants action; the wicked servant (unprofitable servant, Matt. 25:30) is not excused because he has done no evil with his pound. Sins of omission are as bad as sins of commission, James 4:17.

### 3

This is the last Sunday of the church year—a good time for self-examination. Behind us a whole year in which we have continually taken from the Lord; what have we done with our pound?

Let's come down to actual life. There are young people wasting their time, one of the most precious gifts of God, instead of using it to prepare for a useful life, especially in the Church (divine worship, Sunday school, Bible class, other Christian associations); parents who let their children grow up without thorough instruction in the way of salvation and the Christian life; church members who have time for everything else, but not for meetings; money for everything but church dues.—I have preached this sermon to myself first; now forget me and hear your Lord and mine say, vv. 22-24.

Sins of omission are no trifling matter; that rich man, Luke 16:19, sinned by omission, and he woke up in hell; then he wanted to make up for it; it was too late.

A new church year is coming; there is still time. The same Lord who denounces these sins has provided the cure. Repent, go to Him in faith and prayer, and amend. Even at best there will be much lacking; but let us do our best. The Lord will grant gifts, help, will cover up our failings, and in the end (blessed day!) will say, v. 17.

THEO. HOYER

## Outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons \*

### First Sunday in Advent

Rom. 13:11-14

The season of Advent has come. Let it not merely mark a milestone in the annual succession of the seasons, but a period of blessing, reminding us that Jesus comes again with His grace, Spirit, forgiveness, comfort, and loving aid. We are exhorted to

---

\* Beginning with this issue we are offering our readers outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons. These texts have not been treated in our periodical since 1933. In the intervening years we have published outlines on the following series: 1934, Occasional Sermons; 1935, Standard

turn a new page, not principally in the almanac, but in our spiritual conditions, taking flight from worldliness, indifference to the truth, service of self, unbelief, and perhaps despair, into the arms of the Savior, who welcomes us in the Word and the Sacraments. Advent speaks of a threefold coming of Christ: at Bethlehem; in the means of grace; on the Day of Judgment. The last-named is the theme of our Epistle. Paul discourses on

### The Coming of the Everlasting Day

#### 1

*The coming will take place soon.* Even in Paul's day, according to the timetable of God, it was not far away (vv. 11, 12). How much closer is it in 1945!

Mockers say it will not come at all. Let them look at the frightful ravages of war and the terrors of the atomic bomb. These are signs declaring: The end is approaching!

How near the great day is, no one can say. God has mercifully kept the date a secret. Misguided interpreters, seeking to draw aside the veil, have always been proved false teachers.

It is as with the day of our death. God has not told us precisely when we shall have to depart this life. But our last day is coming; according to God's way of reckoning time, it is near.

#### 2

*It marks the disappearance of night and ushers in the cloudless, perfect, unending day.* We passed through a season of war which may fittingly be likened to a dark, terror-filled night. The dawn has appeared, the cessation of hostilities. Soon we hope there will be with us the bright sunshine of peace. How ardently we shall greet it!

Similarly we Christians, living in a world of sin and sorrow, much encumbered by weaknesses of our own, see the dawn of the day of complete rest, peace, and joy and of reunion with our loved ones appearing on the horizon. What a day it will be!

It will mean our salvation, says Paul, entire rescue from everything evil and ignoble and distressing, our translation into the presence of God and the Lamb.

#### 3

*We should prepare for its coming.* Paul uses vivid imagery. You must be awake when the day arrives. If you sleep, you will not enjoy its beauty. If we engage in deliberate wrongdoing,

---

Gospels; 1936, Synodical Conference Gospels I; 1937, Eisenach Epistles; 1938, no outlines; 1939, Thomasius Gospels; 1940, Synodical Conference Epistles; 1941, Wuertemberg Gospels; 1942, Wuertemberg Epistles; 1943, Synodical Conference Old Testament Texts; 1944, Standard Gospels. We welcome suggestions on a series for next year.—EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

service of the flesh, despising God and the means of grace, we shall not be in a position to welcome the Lord.

Salvation need not be prepared by us, it is ready. But it can be lost by us through unbelief or willful service of sin, which separates us from Jesus.

What an earnest admonition that we wholeheartedly embrace Christ and let no false teaching or form of wickedness draw us away from Him!

W. ARNDT

## Second Sunday in Advent

Rom. 15:4-13

The past years were years of global war and bitter hatred the world over. Peace has been declared. Yet in many circles hatred is still being fostered, and almost world-wide suspicions and jealousies forebode little good for the future. In striking contrast stands the picture of brotherly unity presented in our text by the Apostle as the ideal to be striven for within the Church of Christ on earth.

### The Children of God United in Christ

1. *One in Christian faith and hope*
2. *One in mutual love and service*

#### 1

The Apostle calls attention to a distinction which was so marked in the Old Testament as to constitute a constant source of mutual misunderstanding, contempt, hatred, and open enmity, the distinction between Jew and Gentile. In the New Testament this distinction was wiped out entirely as far as the relation to God and His salvation was concerned (vv. 8-12; cp. Gal. 3:26-29; Eph. 2:11-22; Col. 1:20-22).

This applies also to the distinctions and differences existing to this day in society and also in the Christian church at large and in every congregation. There are, either by divine will or permission, distinctions which are recognized also by Christians: racial, social, cultural, intellectual, financial distinctions; differences as to sex, character, temperament, background, language, experience, custom, etc. Yet as far as the redemption by Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit are concerned, all these distinctions and differences, no matter how great they may loom up in the eyes of men, are nonexistent. All believers without exception with one mind and one mouth glorify God (v. 6). To the Caucasian believer no other God was proclaimed than He whose name was sung to the Mongolian (v. 9). The Anglo-Saxon rejoices in the same Savior whom the Russian praises and lauds

(v. 11). To the infant heir of the millionaire no better Baptism is granted than to the babe of the pauper. The same hope, the same Scripture, the same comfort, the same joy and peace in believing, the same power of the Holy Ghost are granted to each and everyone (vv. 4, 5, 13). All are received by Christ to the glory of God (v. 7). All trust in the same root of Jesse; all are filled with the same hope by the God of Hope (cp. 1 Pet. 1:3-9; 2 Cor. 4:17-5:5); all are ruled by the same gracious King; all are one in faith and hope.

Never forget to thank God, who has granted you this perfect equality before His throne, granted nowhere else in all the world in like measure, which you as a member of the Church of God enjoy through Jesus Christ! And show your gratitude also by loving service to your fellow Christian.

## 2

The glorious fact that all believers are by the grace of God children of the heavenly Father and brethren of all their fellow believers, must be a constant urge to Christian love and forbearance. In general, we should receive one another (v. 7). There must be no coldness, no aloofness, no clannishness, but all, no matter how their outer circumstances differ, should be united in Christian love and fellowship, in mutual affection and brotherly consideration, like-minded one toward another (v. 5).

This brotherly love and consideration is not to cease even if the brother is a weak Christian, rather neglectful in the performance of his Christian duties, crabby, cross, domineering, stingy, or afflicted with any other weakness. He is our brother, and we are our brother's keepers. We must not be satisfied with working out our own salvation, but help our weak brother to become stronger, our fallen brother to arise. Even if our efforts are misunderstood and resented, remember that Christ led a holy life not only for His own sake, but by His life He procured our justification and sanctification. He tried to win the sinners in spite of all ridicule and contempt and sneering insinuations (vv. 2, 3; cp. Luke 15:1 ff.).

For this purpose let us study Scripture (v. 4), there to be instructed and strengthened in brotherly love and patient, unwavering interest in our fellow Christian's salvation; there to find comfort if our endeavors seem fruitless, and hope which nevertheless continues its efforts, even if they seem hopeless.

And let us make the prayer of the Apostle our own personal prayer for a greater measure of patience and love and like-mindedness.

THEO. LAETSCH



---

**Miscellanea**

---

**On the Character of the Christian College**

Writing in the *Christian Century* on the subject "Rethinking the Christian College," Prof. W. Burnet Easton, Jr., of Massachusetts State College, Amherst, expresses important views. We quote his article in part:

"Properly speaking, the Christian college is concerned not with teaching *religion*, but with teaching the *Christian* religion. As Christians, next to our own soul's salvation, our major function in life is to persuade men and women to accept the Christian faith and to live in the Christian way. More precisely, the Protestant Christian college ought to be primarily concerned with the Protestant interpretation of the Christian faith, which we believe to be the true interpretation. This does not mean that a Christian college might not offer courses in comparative religions or in the history of religions. But these are not its major responsibility. And they are not substitutes for Christianity. The Christian college's first responsibility is to graduate students who are convinced Christians, who know what they believe and why.

"There are some, perhaps many, who will say that this is the function of the church, but it is also a function of the Christian college. Those who deny it have not faced the most profound problem of Christian higher education.

"The fact is that there is a basic and inevitable conflict between a Christian education and a 'liberal arts' education. By and large, the liberal arts philosophy of education is directed toward the pursuit of truth, which nobody ever quite catches. In fact, most of our liberal arts colleges glory in the fact that they are 'seekers after the truth.' But Christianity is not a pursuit of the truth. It is a declaration of the truth already revealed, in which all other truths must find their meaning. This is as basically different from the current liberal arts philosophy of education as day is from night. Moreover, to put Christianity into a liberal arts environment is to destroy the Christian faith, for then, of necessity, it can be presented as only one of the many partial truths. This is what has actually happened in our Christian colleges. Christianity (and usually it is not even Christianity but religion) becomes a department and a fragment of the college picture. Even if it is made an important fragment, it is still a distortion of the Christian truth and places Christianity in a false light. Indeed, it seems fair to say that a Christian liberal arts college is a contradiction in terms.

"The criticism of the liberal arts college from the point of view of its cafeteria nature, and of its failure to have a unifying philosophy of education, has been made often enough. The most famous critic is probably Chancellor Hutchins of Chicago. He would make metaphysics the unifying factor. Unfortunately many Christians have hailed this as a hopeful sign. Dr. Hutchins' criticisms of the liberal arts formula have been trenchant, and his courageous readiness to try a new philosophy

is admirable. But, from a Christian point of view, a metaphysics may be no better than a secular or cafeteria philosophy. Indeed, it may be worse, for it gives the illusion of having solved the problem when it only offers a substitute heresy for the true faith. Christianly speaking, heresy is always more dangerous than paganism. Nevertheless one wishes that Christian educators had the same acuteness and administrative courage Chancellor Hutchins has shown.

"The unifying factor for a Christian college must be Christian theology or else the college should not call itself Christian. And this means more than a compulsory chapel and having a 'professor of religion.' If the Christian conceptions of God and man and their relationships are true (and as Christians we accept them as true), there can be no area of life that a Christian theology does not inform. A Christian college is a college that makes every department support and defend the Christian faith. Its primary function is to turn out graduates who are first Christians and secondarily doctors, lawyers, or merchants."

A.

### Concerning Communism

The fact that Russia, officially, is a Communist nation has blinded many Americans to the true meaning and threat of Communism. The fact that Dr. Harold Laski, now prominent in the new British Government, is a militant and shrewd champion of Communism, brings the threat of that philosophy closer to us. We should not let ourselves be deceived. We have been watching Russia's experiment for some years, and by this time we should be able to see how it is panning out. Communism has brought to the peoples of the Soviet Republics no freedom, but regimentation. Away back in 1931, Russia formally gave up the principle of "equal division of unequal earnings," and today she has a large group of "proletarian millionaires" and other privileged groups, whose members enjoy special pensions, whose children attend special schools. From the economic point of view, Communism has failed in Russia. From the point of view of personal liberty it has failed. And its effort to stamp out religion from the life of the people was a pronounced failure before it had fairly begun. Our nation should and can keep on good terms with Russia; but our people should see clearly that Communism, as a form of government, as an economic system and as a religion, has no rightful place in America.—Dr. David De Forest Burrell in *The Presbyterian*.

---

---

## Theological Observer

---

**Indescribable Misery in Central Europe.**—Was there ever suffering on a scale like that which is witnessed in Europe at present? The Nazi atrocities have ceased, but now there is the woe caused by hunger, nakedness, lack of shelter, the total dearth of medical supplies, the coming winter, unemployment, absolute destitution, separation from one's family, and, if some reports can be credited, shocking mistreatment here and there of the inhabitants by the Russian troops of occupation. One report says that seven million refugees are now endeavoring to reach their former home, traveling in whatever way they can. The reports that reach Geneva on conditions in Hungary, Austria, and Eastern Germany contain these tragic words: "Critical food situation—disease spreading—many suicides—hundreds of thousands of refugees left starving—churches trying to help but completely overwhelmed." Conditions are simply too sad for words. What are we doing? What can we do? Are we all giving serious thought to the question how aid may be furnished to those caught in this huge net of unparalleled distress? Whoever has a profitable suggestion or can point to an avenue of help which may be utilized should share his insight or information with the brethren. A.

**The Pronouncement of the Wisconsin Synod on the Doctrinal Affirmation and Related Subjects.**—At its recent biennial meeting, held August 1—8 in New Ulm, Minn., our sister synod, the honorable Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States, passed resolutions of which the other synods of the Synodical Conference will have to take cognizance. We believe it best to reprint the paragraphs on "Church Union" written by the Rev. A. P. Voss, one of the editors of the *Northwestern Lutheran*, the official organ of our brethren, in the account of the convention (see *Northwestern Lutheran* for September 2):

"While our pastors generally are familiar with church union matters, the laymen may not be too well informed. The matter of church union involves the question whether a union—altar and pulpit fellowship—between our sister synod of Missouri and the American Lutheran Church (a merger of the Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo Synods) and subsequently a union between the Synodical Conference and the American Lutheran Church can be established now or later without compromising the truth of God's inspired Word. The question is whether true unity in doctrine and practice exists between the Synodical Conference and the American Lutheran Church, for a union without this unity is impossible.

"Our synod has a standing committee which serves as a 'watchman unto the house of Israel' in church union matters. This standing committee presented a brief report to the convention at New Ulm in which it called attention to the 'Doctrinal Affirmation,' a document prepared by 'The Committee on Doctrinal Unity in the Lutheran Church of America' (Missouri Synod Committee) and 'The Committee on Intersynodical Fellowship of the American Lutheran Church.' Our standing committee

declared that it is not satisfied that the truth of God's Word is adequately safeguarded by the 'Doctrinal Affirmation,' and that our committee stands ready to present its misgivings to our sister synod of Missouri. Our committee further reported that the problem of church union has become more difficult because of a number of incidents which anticipate a union between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church which does not yet exist. Official protest in these matters has been filed with the Synodical Conference, and the protest is now before a Committee on Intersynodical Relations which has been appointed by that body.—Upon recommendation of the floor committee of the convention, the report of our standing committee was adopted by unanimous vote.

"The protest referred to above was presented to the convention of the Synodical Conference at Cleveland in 1944 by President John Brenner. It reads in part, 'We feel constrained to state at this time that we have been seriously perturbed by numerous instances of an anticipation of a union (between the Missouri and the American Lutheran Church) not yet existing. . . . It will suffice to adduce only a few: Co-operation with the National Lutheran Council in the work among the prisoners of war, participation with others in the dedication of Service Centers, a Synodical Conference pastor serving as a guest essayist at the convention of a District of the American Lutheran Church, etc.—It is our firm conviction that the cause of true unity is not furthered by such actions, which can only put undue pressure behind the "union movement" and cause confusion in the Church.'—The convention at New Ulm endorsed this protest.

"The question of 'co-operation in externals,' is one phase of the church union matter. The convention adopted as Scripturally correct an expression of President John Brenner which states in part, 'We realize clearly and deeply deplore the harm that is being done by the division in the Lutheran Church, but we are firmly convinced that the welfare of our Lutheran Church and of the Christian Church as a whole will be truly served only when we frankly acknowledge these differences in doctrine and practice as actually existing and as being divisive of fellowship, and when we then by prayerful searching of the Holy Scriptures endeavor to arrive at the *unity that is the work of the Holy Ghost*. You will always find us most willing to take part in doctrinal discussions which have this purpose. "Co-operation in externals" (what in church work can truly be said to be purely external?) may hide our wounds, but it will not heal them. Joint endeavors will not remove the existing differences, but it may lead us to forget them and to grow indifferent to the authority of the inspired Word.'

"A complete transcript of the report on church union matters will appear in the synodical report.

"The spirit of our standing committee and of the Wisconsin Synod in these matters is expressed in a letter addressed to our sister synod of Missouri, 'We sincerely cherish and desire to preserve the fellowship which we enjoy in our Synodical Conference.—Hoping and praying to God that we come to a favorable understanding and agreement.'"

The convention essay dealt with the question of church union.

Its fourth part is thus summarized in the *Northwestern Lutheran*: "In the *fourth part*, what might be called modern back doors through which Unionism would surreptitiously enter our church were briefly discussed. As such were mentioned: co-operation in so-called externals; allocation of mission fields, and other co-ordination of church work; joint service centers with a joint dedicatory service; combining of eleemosynary undertakings; 'selective fellowship'; Scoutism, and the like."

In the sections quoted are enumerated some of the issues that are pending between our sister synod and our own body. It is not our intention to argue here the matters in debate. Our brethren of the Wisconsin Synod know as well as we that merely affirming that a certain act is wrong does not make it wrong. The issues will have to be studied in the light of the Word of God and in the spirit of Christian love. We join the brethren in the hope that through such study full agreement on the questions mentioned can be reached. A.

**Luther's Dream Coming True.**—Under this heading the *Lutheran Standard* (Sept. 22, 1945) states editorially that the "latest word about the Evangelical Church in Germany is that the leaders in it hope within the next decade to see the Church entirely supported by voluntary offerings instead of through State-collected taxes. This new development in the separation of Church and State in Germany is in line with Martin Luther's ideas on the subject. One might say it is a fulfillment of Luther's dream. Luther's own personal preference was for a congregational form of government rather than for a State Church. However, political and social conditions at Luther's time were not ripe for the full translation into action of the Reformer's convictions regarding the distinctive spheres of Church and State. In the free air and on the free soil of America Luther's principles flowered and fruited into full separation of Church and State and now, over four centuries after Luther lived and wrought, those same principles seem about to bear similar fruit in Luther's homeland." Editor Schramm's declarations rest upon well-documented historic proof, as every student of Luther's works knows, even such as have merely studied Articles XVI and XXVIII of the Augsburg Confession, which, as Luther said, contains his theology. But now comes Prof. E. G. Schwiebert of Valparaiso University and shows in a neat little monograph, "The Medieval Pattern in Luther's Views of the State," "that Luther's views of the State accepted the medieval pattern of a *Weltchristentum*. By changing the Church, however, from a visible, corporate, legal personality to an invisible kingdom, making all Christians priests before God, he also changed the functions of the State. In this changed picture the German princes were also morally responsible for the religious conditions in their lands. In drawing a clear-cut line of demarcation between man's body, property, and outward possessions on the one side, and his soul, conscience, and the things of the spirit on the other, Luther also definitely clarified the scope of the State in the old medieval pattern. Perhaps, in this we have another source of our Bill of Rights" (p. 21). Both Editor Schramm and Professor Schwiebert emphasize important elements in Luther's view-



point of the relation of the State to the Church. What the two writers say is not contradictory, but supplementary. Luther perceived that a so-called State Church is indeed possible, though perhaps not preferable. His contribution to the philosophy of the problem was his clear-cut line of demarcation between the earthly and the spiritual, or between what belongs to the body and what belongs to the spirit. In this, as Professor Schwiebert remarks, we have another source of our Bill of Rights. This clear-cut line of demarcation between the earthly and the heavenly ultimately had to result in separation of Church and State where there was "free air and free soil" for "Luther's principles to flower and fruit" into reality. J. T. M.

**Regarding the Doctrine of the Real Presence.**—In the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* (October, 1944), Dr. Gohdes published an article in which he queried the traditional Lutheran doctrine concerning the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper. The article caused considerable discussion and has led W. O. Doescher, a colleague of Dr. Gohdes, in the same periodical (July, 1945) to defend his viewpoint. In the first place, Dr. Doescher declares that Dr. Gohdes' article does not question the Real Presence, for he asserts this presence in such statements and expressions as: "Christ Himself is present in the Supper"; "The central feature of the doctrine is communion between the believer and the Christ of the Cross, present in the Sacrament"; [the elements] "convey Christ Himself as the life of our life"; "The essence of the Sacrament is the presence of Christ imparting Himself to the recipient"; "The reception of Himself with the blessings He wrought for us"; "The interpenetration of our life with that of Christ"; "Jesus gives Himself to us in the Holy Supper." Finally (as the writer says), Dr. Gohdes himself states in so many words that he does not wish to question the Real Presence. However, as Dr. Doescher goes on to say, despite our protestations (so Dr. Gohdes contends) historians can hardly be blamed for holding that Lutheranism teaches consubstantiation and a material eating and drinking of that for which, according to the intent of the Divine Founder, the bread and wine are intended to serve as vehicles, that is, the body and blood of Christ. Dr. Doescher, moreover, declares that (according to Dr. Gohdes) the Confessional concepts are not free from residual Romanist presuppositions, that is, from the view that the essence of the Sacrament consists in an *ex opere operato* absorption of inanimate, impersonal, supernatural substances, rather than in a personal transaction with the living, personal, and exalted Redeemer. Again, Dr. Doescher says that Dr. Gohdes' conception, perhaps, absorbs into a more integral view the substance of the Confessional doctrine while it dissents from some of the terminology and the concepts by which it is set forth. Dr. Doescher calls his colleague's view of the Real Presence the "personal conception" and that of the Confessions the "celestial substance conception" of the Real Presence. For the first view, "body and blood" means the incarnate life of the living and ascended Savior which He gave into suffering and death for our redemption, which view assimilates Christ's "body and blood" to the whole Christ, who gives Himself to us in the Holy Supper in agreement with His promise. The other view (as Dr. Doescher says)

interprets the Real Presence as the presence of the substance "body" and "blood" *per se* in abstraction from the "whole Christ." Then he goes on to defend Dr. Gohdes' "personal conception" of the real presence over against the "celestial substance conception," and he suggests that while the dogma of the Holy Communion is not a controversial issue among Lutherans, its doctrinal formulation has become so excessively rigid in our circles that this very fact is an excellent reason for re-examining the doctrine. He says: "The time is ripe for a modern statement of the Lutheran faith in terms less dependent on scholastic terms and modes of thought, but in conformity with modern insights and oriented to the specific issues of our days and age." Lastly, he writes: "The final reason is that such a discussion is a contribution to the ecumenical movement. Some of us entertain the conviction that the breach that divided the Reformers is not final and irrevocable. If a re-examination of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper does not demonstrate 'another spirit,' of which Luther complained, but if a deeper view suggests the possibility that modern Reformed and Lutheran positions may ultimately be reconcilable, should not such a proposal be eagerly welcomed and examined with great care and with Christian hope and patience?"

If it is true that to Lutherans the Real Presence means no more than that "Christ Himself is present in the Supper," or that "the essence of the Sacrament is the presence of Christ" or what the other statements quoted from Dr. Gohdes' article declare, then indeed the fundamental difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism is eliminated, but in such a way that the doctrine of Luther and of the Lutheran Confessions is discarded. No Reformed theologian has ever objected to such statements as Dr. Doescher quotes from the article of Dr. Gohdes, but what they all with one accord objected to is the doctrine of Scripture that in the Sacrament Christ's true body and blood are received in, with, and under the bread and wine, including the *manducatio oralis* and the *manducatio indignorum*. To Calvinists and Lutheran crypto-Calvinists that doctrine has always been a stumbling block and foolishness. But just that is the teaching of Scripture, and therefore nothing else can be substituted for that doctrine. The offense does not lie in the Lutheran formulation of the doctrine, but in Christ's own teaching of the Lord's Supper. It is, of course, impossible for us to enter upon all the misinterpretations of the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence put forth outside and within the Lutheran Church. But let it be said that the Lutheran Church has never taught what Dr. Doescher implies in his so-called "celestial substance conception" of the Real Presence. Nor has the Lutheran Church ever taught any *ex opere operato* absorption of supernatural substances, nor any consubstantiation, nor any material [Capernaïtic] eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood. Nor is it true that Dr. Gohdes' conception absorbs into a more integral view the substance of the Confessional doctrine while it merely dissents from some of its terminology; Dr. Gohdes' presentation is rather a departure *in toto* from Luther's doctrine of the Real Presence. Nor is it true that the Lutherans have ever interpreted the Real Presence as the presence of the substance "body" and "blood" *per se* in abstraction from

the whole Christ. As a matter of fact, Luther and the Lutheran Confession have never endeavored to explain the mystery of the Real Presence beyond Christ's clear words of institution. The undersigned certainly deprecates a controversy in Lutheran churches on the Lord's Supper, but he does desire a re-study of the doctrine in the light of Scripture, Article VII of the Formula of Concord, one of the greatest documents ever produced on the Lord's Supper, and Luther's four great writings against the Sacramentarians ("Against the Heavenly Prophets," 1525; "That These Words of Christ: 'This Is My Body,' etc., Still Stand Against the Enthusiasts," 1527; "Luther's Confession Concerning the Lord's Supper," 1528; "Luther's Brief Confession Against the Enthusiasts," 1544). When writing these immortal monographs, Luther was largely dealing with the most erudite theologians, the most subtle thinkers, of his age, who opposed the Scripture doctrine of the Real Presence with every possible substitute that human reason might invent. But with overwhelming power Luther demonstrated from Holy Scripture that no such human substitute (e. g., the whole Christ for: "This is My body; this is My blood") is permissible without violation of the clear words of Scripture. Let Lutherans, then, not depart from the doctrine of the Lutheran Confessions; in particular, let them not make concessions on this point to Calvinists in the interest of the ecumenical movement (union between Lutherans and Calvinists), for that would amount to a downright denial of the plain Scripture truth. Let them rather hold in sincere faith to the plain words of institution, following the explanation of the doctrine as given in the closing paragraph of Article VII (Epitome) of the Formula of Concord: "We maintain and believe, according to the simple words of the testament of Christ, the true, yet supernatural eating of the body of Christ, as also the drinking of His blood, which human senses and reason do not comprehend, but as in all other articles of faith our reason is brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ, and this mystery is not apprehended otherwise than by faith alone, and revealed in the Word alone" (*Triglott*, p. 817). By the way, just now also other churches are taking up the doctrine of the Lord's Supper for study. The *Living Church*, for example (Episcopalian), has published a series of articles on the subject, which manifest much reading and much thinking on the dogma, though, of course, they run along Catholic and Reformed lines. Very interesting is the discussion of the problem of concomitance and of intinction in the issue of May 6, 1945. Lutherans certainly cannot afford to neglect the study of this tremendously important doctrine.

J. T. M.

**Some Expressions on the Atomic Bomb.**—As was to be expected, the church papers, as well as other publications, have written extensively on the atomic bomb, which was the center of interest during the last days of the war. We here list some of the statements that have appeared on this subject. A number of clergymen in New York, among them George A. Buttrick and Rufus M. Jones, have called the atomic bomb "an atrocity of a new magnitude." Bernard Shaw, the well-known playwright, issued this statement, "Like the sorcerer's apprentice [Cf. Goethe's *Zauberlehrling*, A.], we may practice our magic without knowing how

to stop it, thus fulfilling the prophecy of Prospero. In view of our behavior recently, I cannot pretend to deprecate such a possibility; but I think it worth mentioning." Jacques Errera, professor of chemophysics of the University of Brussels, says, "If this war were not the last world war, it would be one before last anyway, for, henceforth, with the utilization of the atomic bombs and the V-2 weapons, war would mean the destruction of the earth." This statement is found in a weekly publication called *News from Belgium*. In the *Lutheran Companion* an editorial contains these paragraphs: "Frederick Kuh, writing from London to an American newspaper, declares that the satisfaction experienced by the atomic bomb's part in dictating Japan's surrender offer has been 'overshadowed by a sense of helpless terror at the limitless implications of this scientific apocalypse.'"

"The English," he continues, 'so commonly branded as hypocrites, have been among the first to apply self-criticism toward their own moral attitude.' British writers in London papers have recalled the outburst of indignation among their own people when the Germans started indiscriminate bombing with flying robots and rockets last year and how they demanded that the scientists who invented these weapons should be branded as war criminals and brought to trial for their lives, and they are asking if the same attitude should now be assumed toward the scientists who perfected a weapon 'a thousand times more barbarous.'"

"The Britishers admit that it would not be difficult to imagine the outburst of morally furious headlines in England had the Germans dropped atomic bombs on Manchester, London, Chicago, or New York.

"To have withheld the atomic bomb,' declares one writer, 'would have been a greater act than to use it.'"

A.

**Dr. C. E. Macartney on the Theological Chaos in Northern Presbyterianism.**—Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney is a singularly able and influential minister of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America (Northern Presbyterian), who has always sponsored adherence to a conservative course in theology. He is the author of many books and pamphlets, and for a number of years has been pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa. In a recent article appearing in the *Presbyterian* of August 16, 1945, he speaks of the endeavors made soon after the Civil War to heal the breach caused by the secession of Southern Presbyterians from the mother church in 1861. The article is worth careful study. The Southerners, when (in 1871) invited to return to the former fellowship, pointed to various barriers that would have to be removed, some of them having to do with the slavery question, one, however, with the union of the Old and New School Assemblies in Northern Presbyterianism, a union (effected in 1869) on a very slender platform, viz., "the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our Common Standards." In other words, the two schools united by merely saying that both parties were willing to be loyal to the Presbyterian confessions, without clarifying the points of doctrine which had separated them several decades before. The Southern Presbyterians declared that the methods of the union involved "a total surrender of all the great testimonies of the Church for the fundamental

doctrines of grace," and that the Northern Assembly "must come at length to embrace nearly all shades of doctrinal belief." Dr. Macartney's final paragraph states that this mournful prophecy has been fulfilled. He writes:

"Today, I take it, there are few, if any, in the Southern Church who oppose the union on the ground so strongly urged by their Assembly of 1870, viz., the attitude of the Northern Church with regard to matters of social and political significance. But there are many in the Southern Church, and not a few, too, in the Northern Church, who are convinced that when the Southern Assembly of 1870, in answer to the union overtures from the Northern Church, declared that the Northern Church had united in a way which would bring it in time to 'embrace nearly all shades of doctrinal belief,' it was a true prophet of what has taken place in the Northern Church. Nothing could be easier than to show, from sermons, lectures, books, and united testimonies by ministers of the Northern Church today that that Church now 'embraces nearly all shades of doctrinal belief.'"

Let those Lutherans who hold that the mere unfurling of the Lutheran flag suffices as a basis for union of Lutheran bodies take notice!

A.

**Catholics and Religious Liberty.**—It has often been pointed out how unwilling Romanists are in predominantly Roman Catholic countries to accord to Protestants the boon of religious freedom which they avidly claim as their right in countries where Protestants are more numerous. One of the ways in which Romanists in the United States endeavor to justify this attitude of their Church can be seen in an editorial of *America* (Jesuit weekly) for Sept. 1, having the caption "Religious Liberty for Catholics." It reads thus:

"Religious liberty is being kept a piping-hot issue by our Protestant brethren—religious liberty at least for themselves and especially, at the moment, religious liberty without limit on the South American front. But on the home front, for Catholics! Well, there are penalties attached and well-defined limits. This we gather from comments in prominent Protestant journals, like the *Christian Century*, which are highly exercised over the possibility that Federal aid may be given to non-public schools. In effect they maintain that if Catholics want their own schools, let them pay the bill in full. It makes no difference that this means double taxation. It makes no difference that this means paying a heavy penalty for the religious liberty guaranteed by the Constitution and vindicated by the Supreme Court. No, there must be no State or Federal aid to non-public schools because this would violate our sacred principle of separation of Church and State. The real 'because' is that such aid would go principally to Catholic schools, which happen to be the most numerous in the non-public-school category. When there were many Protestant schools a few generations ago, the 'separation of Church and State' principle did not hinder their fervent bid for State and Federal aid. They know perfectly well that separation of Church and State is not the real issue now either. If they don't know it, let them read the First Amendment of the Constitution, which is the supposed classic statement of the principle of separation.



To erect the principle out of that Amendment would be to perform a piece of sleight of hand worthy of awed acclaim. If they do know it, then in the name of honesty why not say outright that full religious liberty in the United States is reserved to them alone by force of their numbers. But that, of course, would be to throw a whole bucketful of cold water on the issue of religious liberty in South America."

This is flimsy argumentation, as no one knows better than those numerous Lutherans who gladly pay their public school taxes while they, in addition, maintain their Christian day school. We doubt very much that the chief reason of Protestants, generally speaking, for opposing State support of private religious schools is that if such aid were granted the Roman Catholic Church would be the chief beneficiary. And if this were the motive, could Rome complain? Its own record of intolerance and bloody persecution of dissenters has been such that no state can be blamed for being very cautious before adopting a course which would be particularly advantageous to Romanism.

A.

**The Late Bishop Edwin H. Hughes of the Methodist Episcopal Church on His Attitude to the Lodge.**—A friend handed us an excerpt from the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of September 10, 1925, in which a visit of the late Bishop Hughes in St. Louis is described. A few of his remarks addressed to the Conference on that occasion should be quoted. The reporter says that the bishop asked the ministers candidly if they were sure they were attending the Conference "in the spirit of Jesus Christ," and he counseled them not to let "sociability" interfere with the devotions. "You may wonder why your congregation is not more religious. It is because you are not more religious. I belong to a lodge. I expect to die in that lodge. I pay my dues and go when I can. But when I die, that lodge is not going to have any part in my funeral. I am going to be buried by the Gospel of Christ and nothing else. And there are not going to be any symbols on my tombstone that cannot be shared by my two little children that are in heaven today." Some darkness—and some light.

A.

**The "Calvin Forum" Celebrates Its Tenth Anniversary.**—The latest issue of the *Calvin Forum* (August-September, 1945; Vol. XI, No. 1-2) appears as the "tenth-birthday" number of this interesting, instructive, and stimulating Calvinistic monthly. Its editor in chief, Dr. Clarence Bouma, writes editorially: "The magazine was born from the deep conviction that Calvinism is the need of the age because it is the highest and richest formulation of the truth of God. Our journal is the embodiment of the conviction that we must propagate the God-centered view of the Scriptures in its application to every phase of scholarly endeavor and to the solution of every problem of Christian living." These are excellent words from the viewpoint of Calvinistic conviction, though here immediately begins the conflict between Lutheranism and Calvinism with regard to their different views of Scripture and the world. Yet Calvinism must speak as it does because it is moved by deep-rooted convictions just as confessing Lutheranism is. While the *Calvin Forum* is not the official periodical of Calvin College and Calvin Seminary

(Grand Rapids, Mich.), the faculties of these two educational institutions have largely supported it by their influence and literary contributions. The *Calvin Forum* is not a Fundamentalist periodical, but orthodoxly Calvinistic, though it appreciates the contributions of Fundamentalism to the cause of evangelization in our country. The magazine pursues a different aim, namely, the moral and intellectual appeal to the believing intelligentsia in our land. The anniversary number emphasizes the "great need for sound, scholarly literature that is true to the Word of God and thoroughly abreast of the times in which we live." "This need," it says, "must be met. Liberalism has failed to meet it. It has offered an avalanche of religious and scholarly books in recent decades, but these have served not to build up, but to tear down the truth as it is in Christ. Fundamentalism is beginning to produce an abundance of books of late, but most of them are of a devotional nature and do not command the attention of the informed and scholarly mind. One of the reasons our colleges have in the past succumbed so readily to the onslaughts of an ungodly philosophy and science, is found in the influence of textbooks that were the very opposite of being biblical and theistic. Even now there is a growing demand for a scholarly presentation of the Christian Faith from quarters which until recently compromised that faith with anti-Christian theories and ideologies. Here Calvinism has a great opportunity and is meeting a real challenge. Would that Christian people understood how important it is to set men to work to produce such scholarly works. Many such works are the incidental by-products of classroom teaching and have come into existence in that way. But what we need is men who are given time and opportunity to concentrate on such writing. Some liberal universities and seminaries have appointed a few faculty members with the proper equipment and enthusiasm to devote themselves exclusively or largely to research and writing rather than to teaching. If Calvinism is to be propagated, it must be done both in popular and in scholarly form. The latter is by far the most difficult and exacting. We need a body of up-to-date scholarly works written from the biblical, God-centered point of view that can command the respectful attention of scholars, of those who are searching, and of the students in our higher educational institutions." Certainly, most true! The *Calvin Forum* combines in an admirable way theological and non-theological articles. Its forte seems to be Christian Apologetics. A commendable feature of the magazine is the department "From Our Correspondents," which offers detailed and well-written letters by representative, well-informed Calvinists from all over the world. Its book reviews are thorough, honest, and reliable. There is much we Lutherans can learn from this monthly.

J. T. M.

**Fosdick Still a Radical Modernist.**—Replying to a letter of inquiry as to his present religious status, Dr. Fosdick wrote as follows:

"I have received your letter. I am constantly astonished at the things people say about me, and never much more so than by the report that you sent me of the strange statement in your recent discussion group. He never read any statement from me publicly announcing my change of thought. I am a liberal in theology, and have been so

ever since I was a young man. Far from changing, I have gone straight ahead with it, and I should say again just what I said to you in the letter that I wrote you on January 4, 1937.

"Of course, I do not believe in the Virgin Birth, or in that old fashioned substitutionary doctrine of the Atonement; and I do not know any intelligent Christian minister who does. The trouble with these fundamentalists is that they suppose that unless one agrees with them in their doctrinal set-up, he cannot believe in the profound, substantial, everlasting truths of the Christian gospel that transform men's lives, and are the only hope of Christ's saviorhood in this world. When, then, they hear me proclaiming these everlasting truths, they think I must believe in their fundamentalism. As a matter of fact, I regard it as a perversion of the Christian gospel." (Cf. *Christian Beacon*, Sept. 13, 1945.)

**The Role of Bishop Dibelius in Germany and the Relations of the Church to the State.**—The *Religious News Service* publishes a statement by Stuart W. Herman which may not have been read by all of our subscribers and which hence we insert here.

"Within the next decade the Evangelical Church in Germany hopes to dispense with all financial assistance from the State, according to Bishop D. Otto Dibelius, head of the new Church government in Berlin.

"Bishop Dibelius revealed that 'every effort' is being made to teach Church members to support the Evangelical Church with voluntary offerings instead of through State-collected taxes.

"Principal reason for abolishing the old system gradually, he explained, is that the average loyal Church member is in desperate financial straits and cannot assume immediately the entire burden which otherwise is spread thinly over the whole nominally Christian population.

"When Bishop Dibelius preached his first sermon since Germany's surrender, over 10,000 marks were laid on offering plates where the average collection never amounted to more than 250 marks.

"Bishop Dibelius also disclosed that during the war the Confessional Churches secretly raised more than 2,000,000 marks annually to pay the salaries of 1,000 young ministers trained in forbidden seminaries and refused ordination by Hitlerite Church authorities.

"In Southern Germany, 77-year-old Bishop Theophilus Wurm of Wuerttemberg, who throughout the war was German Protestantism's most outspoken anti-Nazi champion, is stressing the slogan, 'not restoration but regeneration.'

"Calling for a thorough cleansing of the entire Church 'from the bottom up,' Bishop Wurm suggested the election of anti-Nazi councils in every local congregation and election of delegates to a National Synod to be held next year. In between these lowest and highest councils, he would have provincial synods or assemblies.

"Pastor Eberhard Roehricht, successor to Pastor Martin Niemoeller at the famous Jesus Christ Church in Berlin, has been preaching 'repentance' to his congregation without mincing words.

"Recently, as rain dripped steadily through a gaping hole in the ceiling of the beautiful main church, and with the congregation crowded

into a suffocatingly small room or standing in the hall, he declared that 'a brand-new beginning must be made with God.'

"Speaking on the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, he told the congregation that the Christians of Germany were Pharisees, praying, 'I thank Thee that I am not as this man,' if they thought they didn't belong among sinners of the Third Reich.

"Pastor Roehricht's sermon was in line with the official declaration of Bishop Dibelius, which stated: 'I say bluntly that authorities of our Church who permitted themselves to become tools of un-Christian ambitions these last ten years have burdened themselves with great guilt. This guilt must be acknowledged and expiated by disappearance from Church administration positions.'

"Spiritual rehabilitation, however, isn't easy under present restrictions. No religious matter may be published, and radio services cannot be held. But in the American and British sectors of Berlin, religious instruction is proceeding. German Communists are blamed for impeding religious activity in the Russian sector.

"Pastor Heinrich Grueber and Fr. Buchold, Protestant and Catholic clergymen who conduct the Berlin City Council's office for Church Affairs, said that 90 per cent of parents support religious training where it is available.

"At a recent meeting of the Confessional Church's Synod in Berlin, an integrated plan for educating German youth was approved and has already been put into effect." A.

**Brief Items.**—A Protestant Episcopal Church (Calvary) of Philadelphia, a white congregation, has decided to call a colored minister as its pastor. He has been invited to bring the congregation which he has served thus far, St. Michael's Mission, into the membership of Calvary. The *Living Church* quotes these words of the vestry of Calvary Congregation, "The coming of Father Logan means, therefore, that the services of Calvary will remain as they have been for more than forty years, during which period several Negro families have been regular and honored members of the parish family. Consequently, except for the presence of a greater number of Negroes than before and filled pews instead of empty ones, you will find everything as usual."

"There is no commentary on 'the Revelation.' Do not try to explain it, but preach its Gospel." Dr. Roswell D. Hitchcock quoted in the *Presbyterian*. This is advice one would like to pass on to the chiliastic commentators on the last book of the Bible.

Before William Henry Hoover died in 1931, he set aside \$50,000 as a trust fund for the promotion of Christian unity. The proceeds will be used by the men entrusted with the management of the fund to provide an annual series of lectures on the subject of Christian unity. The lectures, which are to be delivered in the Disciples Divinity House adjacent to the campus of the University of Chicago, will be published in book form.

Eleven missionaries of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and the Women's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society were put to death by the Japanese in the Philippine Islands. A story of their

martyrdom has been issued and may be obtained from the secretary of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, Dr. Jesse R. Wilson, 152 Madison Ave., New York 16, N. Y. The book costs 25 cents.

According to Vatican regulations the College of Cardinals may have as high as 70 members. At present there are 39. Some observers believe that soon a large number will be added, perhaps 27. America may receive 6 or 7, one of them in all probability Archbishop Francis J. Spellman. American pastures must look rather inviting when most of Europe has become a desert.

From Pasadena, Calif., word was sent around the world that the universe would end Friday, September 21. The authority for that statement was a former missionary, Rev. Charles G. Long, and his source of information a vision in which three times the number 610 was written for addition purpose beneath 1260, 1290, and 1335. Mr. Long explains the sums as follows: 1870 ended (?) papal supremacy; 1900 brought the twentieth century; and 1945 will write "finis" for our globe. Believe it or not, the man has (or had) 50 followers.

According to the *Protestant Voice* more than 1,500,000 boys and girls in our country will receive religious instruction in our public schools under the weekday religious education program. This means that there is an increase of 50 per cent in the number of communities that participate. 1,800 cities and towns in 46 States will hold released-time classes.

Oslo University of Norway, closed by Nazi decree in November, 1943, has been re-opened. *News of Norway* states that never before have classrooms and corridors been so crowded. "About three times as many students are now applying for admission to these colleges and universities as can be cared for by the existing facilities." The sentence implies that there are other colleges and universities in Norway besides the one at Oslo.

The *Lutheran Messenger*, English language organ of the Lutheran Free Church, now has a full-time editor, Rev. Sverre Torgerson.

"In days in which we talk much about getting man's relationship with his fellow man right and about the brotherhood of nations, we must be careful never to lose sight of the thing that is even more important, and that is man's relationship with God." — Sir William Dobbie, the celebrated Defender of Malta.

Church membership in the United States has reached an all-time high of 72,492,669, more than 52 per cent of the population, according to the 1945 edition of the *Year Book of the American Churches*. The figure represents a gain of 3,991,483 in two years. (Associated Press Dispatch.) In this connection it might be stated that Northern Presbyterians report that their church membership is now the largest in the history of the denomination — 2,161,872.

Two bodies of Mennonites are considering a merger, namely, the Central Conference of Mennonites and the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America. The former body has three thousand members, the latter is the second largest Mennonite group, consisting of 36,000 members.



What is the status of religious liberty in Spain? The so-called Bill of Rights states that the Catholic Church is the State Church of Spain and it is the only one whose religion may be practiced publicly. The religious liberty granted consists in this, that other church bodies may exist privately and people belonging to them may conduct worship in their homes, but they must not do so publicly.

According to a report from Mexico, Roman Catholic persecutions of Protestants continue. Recently the corpse of a Protestant child was dug up by Catholic vandals and thrown away. This action followed an exciting speech by a Roman priest who had declared that a Protestant child did not deserve burial in a Christian cemetery. A number of stories of beatings and of other forms of cruel mistreatment against Protestants are submitted. (See *Christian Century* for September 19, p. 1069.)

Concerning psychiatric quacks: "The ideal client is one who has some money, not much sense, and a real or imaginary trouble—and an imaginary trouble is real for the person who has it if he believes it is real. Since these specifications describe a very large per cent of the total population, the field for exploitation is immense."—From a review in the *Christian Century*.

At Vellore in Southern India a hospital is located which has frequently been used by our missionaries. At its head, until recently, was Dr. Ida S. Scudder, belonging to the famous Scudder family, four generations of which have been serving as physicians and medical missionaries in the Orient. She founded a college at Vellore in 1918, and with that college is connected the hospital spoken of. The college is a co-educational Christian medical school.

Clifford P. Smith, who twice served as president of the Christian Science Society and who for a number of years edited one of its papers, died on August 8, thus helping to demonstrate the falsity of the Christian Science religion.

After hearing a group of children sing over KFUO, a St. Louis woman, who was born in the town of Brinnana in Mount Liban Libonaise Republic, Syria, about one-half day carriage drive from Briouth, Syria, wrote: "It took my mind to my childhood days back in Syria when I used to sing all those songs your children's class sing in English. I sang them the same tune, only in the Arabic language."

A modern version of Philip and the Eunuch, Acts 8:26 ff.: "Enclosed find check for \$2.50. I just recently installed a radio in my automobile, as I am a traveling salesman. I now realize what I have missed by not being able to travel with the Word of God. Heretofore I have traveled with Christ in mind, but hearing the beautiful hymns and the Word of God makes traveling more pleasant now. Just this past week I enjoyed the KFUO programs at a distance of 150 miles."—H. H. H. A.

---